

## **The Following Books or Ebooks may be of use to you If this current Ebook is helpful.**

Most of these Ebooks are available online, Free (PDF).

Search the Titles or Authors or Keywords and you may be able to find them, under" Bible Society Apocrypha" for now.

1. A Plea for the Canon of Scripture  
by the Edinburgh Bible Society
2. Vindication of the Proceedings of the Edinburgh Bible Society  
related to the Apocrypha by the Edinburgh Bible Society
3. STATEMENT of the Bible Society Concerning  
the Apocrypha -1825  
by the Edinburgh Bible Society
4. The 1840 Report of the American Bible Society.  
This was a response to the Proceedings of the Bible Convention- Which Met  
in Philadelphia, April 26, 27, 28, and 29, 1837. This is the documentation  
for the founding of the American and Foreign Bible Society. [Available  
online via Google Books]

The ABS (American Bible Society) report of 1840  
which admits that the American Bible Society was promoting  
Roman Catholic Editions, was shocking since the Bible Society  
was claiming to be Protestant, and the Inquisition was still in progress.  
This has been made available online so people can see for themselves.

For more information concerning Textual Criticism  
and Versions, you may find the following Ebook:

Hidden History of the Greek Testament  
-----

Also more information on books of interest  
at the back of this volume.



A  
VINDICATION  
OF THE  
PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
EDINBURGH BIBLE SOCIETY,  
RELATIVE TO  
THE APOCRYPHA,  
AGAINST THE  
ASPERSIONS OF THE "ECLECTIC REVIEW;"  
IN  
A LETTER  
TO THE  
MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE PARENT INSTITUTION.

---

"Neither know I, whether it be more wickedly audacious to fasten on God those things which he never wrote, or to weaken the authority, and deny the sufficiency, of what he hath written."—BISHOP HALL.

---

LONDON :  
PRINTED FOR HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.  
33 PATERNOSTER ROW.

M.DCCC.XXV.

THE COMMITTEE  
OF THE  
BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY

LONDON:

PRINTED BY J. MOYES, BOUVERIE STREET.



TO  
**THE COMMITTEE**  
OF THE  
**BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.**

---

GENTLEMEN,

It is with considerable reluctance, that I have prevailed on myself to address this letter to you, on the subject of the intemperate attack, which has lately been made in the *Eclectic Review*, on the proceedings of the Committee of the Edinburgh Bible Society, relative to the Apocrypha. The high character of that respectable body, the distinguished eminence of many of its members, in point of talent, learning, and piety, as well as the rank which it consequently holds among Christian institutions, might well shield it from calumnious aspersions, and render a vindication of its conduct, altogether useless. But the article which appeared in the September Number of the *Eclectic Review*, has acquired from adventitious circumstances, an importance to which, it was not in itself, by any means entitled; for it has not only been republished as a separate tract, but has obtained a sort of official character from the prevalent report, that it has been reprinted at the expense of some of the leading Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and that it is with their approval, it is now circulating through every part of the British empire. It is on this account that it seems imperative on some of the many members of the Bible Society, who approve of the general conduct of the Committee at Edinburgh, to stand forward for the purpose not merely of rescuing from unmerited obloquy these zealous assertors of the purity of God's Word, but for the sake of protesting against the subtle casuistry, the dangerous principles, and the railing accusations of the *Eclectic Reviewer*. Before I proceed further, I beg to assure the gentlemen of the Committee, that if I address my observations to them, and comment with perfect freedom on the proceedings of the Parent Society, I do so, without the slightest intention of indulging a captious spirit, or giving way to acrimony of sentiment or expression. I remember the respect which is due to the Directors of

an Institution, so noble as the Bible Society; I call to mind their zeal in the service of God, their desire to promote the circulation of his Word, and the abundant success which has crowned their labours; but above all, I recollect the sacred importance of the subject in dispute, and how little room there is for the indulgence of that bitterness, which the frailty of human nature so often blends with the investigation of truth.

The almost professional zeal of the Eclectic Review, in defence of every measure of the Bible Society,\* was sufficient to justify the expectation of no very measured animadversions on the conduct of those, who have opposed the circulation of the Apocrypha. But I confess I was not a little astonished at the nature of the charges brought by that Journal against the Edinburgh Committee. Not content with censuring what appeared to be precipitation and intemperance, this writer accuses the whole Committee of having been actuated by "*vindictive feeling*," and denounces the framers of the statement† as betraying "any thing but a cool head and an *honest heart*:" nor does he stop here; for in the warmth of his zeal he broadly insinuates that their proceedings are of a *mercenary* character, as their source is probably to be traced to an "angry feud which has long subsisted between the Edinburgh printers and the English Universities!!"

I blush for the man who could so far forget the respect due to himself, as to descend to such illiberal personalities and such baseless insinuations; I blush for the Eclectic Review, whose pages have been sullied by such unworthy imputations; but above all I blush for the cause of religion, when I consider that it is in defence of the Bible Society such calumnies are circulated. Injurious invective and uncandid aspersions may supply the place of argument, and add a zest to a dull composition, but never can promote the discovery of truth, or the cause of the Bible. The character of the venerable Vice-President of the Edinburgh Society, who, from a sense of duty alone, appended his name to the obnoxious statement, might at least have operated as a shield, against such rash and wanton insinuations—insinuations which could hardly obtain credit if brought against the most obscure and unbefriended individual. The name of Dr. Davidson stands too high to be injured by the breath of slander; his praises are in all the churches, and although he has never courted the laurels of fame, his disinterested zeal, his laborious exertions, and his extensive usefulness, for a period of sixty years spent in the service of his Master, will cause his name to descend to posterity in the first rank of that long and brilliant catalogue which illustrates the annals of the Church of Scotland.

\* See a flippant attack on that eminent and devoted Missionary, Dr. Henderson, after he was obliged to quit the service of the Bible Society, in the Eclectic Review, 1824.

† The statement is reported to have been drawn up by three distinguished members of the Edinburgh Society.

Before proceeding to expose the injustice of the attack made upon the Edinburgh Committee, it may be necessary to state what are the proceedings, on the part of the Parent Society, against which they remonstrated, and what is the exact nature of the question which now agitates the Christian public. I regret to say, that this is the more imperative, on account of the various misrepresentations with which the ignorance of some, and the prejudices and partial information of others, have encumbered the subject. Even in the *Eclectic Review*, it is alleged with apparent candour, that the *whole* dispute "relates to the practice of the British and Foreign Bible Society in making grants of *money* to foreign societies which circulate the Apocrypha intermingled with the Canonical Scriptures." This is certainly to place the question in the least offensive light possible, but it is not to tell the whole extent of the truth. Doubtless, on the part of the writer there was no intention to mislead, for in a subsequent passage he more fairly states, "the whole question resolves itself into this simple case of conscience, whether it be lawful or expedient to concur in circulating any other canon of Scripture than that which *Protestants* (Christians?) believe to be genuine:" or, in other words, CAN ANY FANCIED IDEAS OF EXPEDIENCY JUSTIFY THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY IN LENDING ITS SANCTION TO A CANON OF SCRIPTURE WHOSE PRETENSIONS IT KNOWS TO BE FALSE? Yes, let us disguise from ourselves the real fact, if we can; but, in spite of every gloss and every palliation, the truth will remain unchanged and unchangeable; for if we send *money*, or, in the terms of the resolution of the 9th of April, of which the Reviewer seems to have been ignorant, *also* make "grants of the canonical books in whole or in part," (mark the facilities afforded for an intermingled Apocrypha!) we are ourselves implicated in the guilt of those societies, which actually falsify the sacred canon, and thereby, in the language of the Edinburgh Resolutions, do indeed "lay a deadly snare for the souls of men."

But although we owe it to the firmness and decision of the advocates for the purity of the Word of God, that this grand question is now reduced within a comparatively narrow compass, very few years have elapsed since the British and Foreign Bible Society did itself directly print, circulate, and sell Bibles interspersed with the fables of Bel and the Dragon, Tobit and his Dog, Susanna and the Elders, and all that mass of contradiction and false prophecy, with which the Apocrypha abounds, and which are so much calculated to throw discredit on the whole Word of God. This surely was an evil, the magnitude of which, we can only fully appreciate when we understand, that the spurious matter is intermingled in such a manner, that there is not only no intimation of the difference between what is inspired and uninspired, but that it is utterly impossible for one who is not intimately acquainted with the Holy Scriptures to detect the imposture.\* For example, those parts that

\* A clergyman who was arguing in favour of the Apocrypha, was lately asked to point out in a Catholic Bible what was Apocryphal in the books of Esther

are added to the books of Daniel and Esther in the Catholic version, do not present even the distinction of chapters; while in the versions of the Greek Church, the interpolations are in some cases still more deceptive. We know that so far as the Roman Catholic Church is concerned, the Council of Trent is chargeable with the fearful crime of having thus poisoned the streams of the fountain of life, but the members of the British and Foreign Bible Society are probably little aware, that they are the first body of Protestants who have ever put their seal to this daring forgery.

Another practice against which the Edinburgh Committee protested, was the annexation of the Apocrypha to the Protestant versions of the Bible intended for the Continent. It is not pretended, that this evil is so enormous as the former, but even this practice is attended with most dangerous consequences. It can not be supposed, that ignorant people should be accustomed to see any book constantly bound up with the Holy Scriptures, without gradually acquiring a veneration for it as "part and parcel" of the Word of God. Nor will the title *Apocryphal*, unaccompanied with any other intimation, be at all sufficient to remove this impression, as a man must be acquainted with Greek in order to understand its meaning, and then it by no means conveys with force the definite idea of its being uninspired. But what must have been the feelings of the Edinburgh Society, when they discovered that in more than one instance, if it had not been for the interference of the Parent Institution, the Apocrypha would not have been added, and the Word of God would have been allowed to circulate pure and unadulterated? What must have been their indignation, when they discovered, that in spite of the earnest entreaties of that venerable servant of God, M. Chabrand, President of the Consistory, and Professor in the College at Toulouse, the Apocrypha was added to the Toulouse and Montauban editions of the Scriptures, and that 16,000 copies of the Bible had been thus contaminated through the instrumentality of the British and Foreign, in concert with the Paris, Bible Society? \* The Parent Committee is not indeed charged with acting in this manner from a love of the Apocrypha, or from ignorance of the evil it contains, but simply with having been led by artful representations and false ideas of expediency, to abandon the straight and narrow path of duty.

Such is a statement of the real question in dispute, and a brief outline of the proceedings of the Parent Society in regard to the Apocrypha. Those who fear God, and "tremble at his word," will easily understand how Christians, while endeavouring to uphold the purity of the sacred oracles, may be influenced by nobler motives than those which the Reviewer professes to comprehend;—how they may be "zealously affected in a good cause," without being

and Daniel. He was compelled to acknowledge his inability to point out "every verse" that was spurious. What then must be the condition of the ignorant and unenlightened?

\* See Minute Book, 1820, also Letter Book, and Mr. Gorham's Statement, 2d edit. p. 20.



guilty of "vindictive feeling," or engaged in "machinations" intended "to divide, and if possible ruin, an institution which is the glory of our country, and the hope of the world." It would be an easy task to expose the rashness, the inconsistency, and the misrepresentations of the Reviewer, in his attempt to blacken the character and destroy the influence of the Edinburgh Committee; but the interests of Divine truth can never be benefited by bandying abusive argument in public controversy; nor shall I seek to expose the weakness of my antagonist, except so far as it is essential to the cause of justice. The charges brought against the proceedings of the Edinburgh Committee, so far as they are tangible, may be reduced to four heads, each of which I shall separately examine: namely, bigotry, precipitation, misrepresentation, and intemperance.

I. *Bigotry*.—The Reviewer commences by quoting the words of an eloquent writer, in reference to the constitution and operation of the Bible Society, which have, as he observes, made it the rallying point for all Christians. Upon this, the Reviewer remarks, that he is unwilling to abandon the idea "as a beautiful chimera," and that he cannot welcome the conclusion to which he alleges we are invited by the Edinburgh Committee, "that no basis can be laid broad enough to render the Society a rallying point for all CHRISTIANS; that the terms of such combinations are unlawful and unholy; and that either the Society must renounce every foreign alliance, or be itself renounced as unworthy of any longer support." Empty declamation will not, however, supply the place of sound argument; and the language of poetry is of all others the least suited for the discussion of a grave and momentous question. But before we admit that the Edinburgh Society have been guilty of such bigotry, permit me to ask where they have invited any one to come to such a conclusion? Is this invitation to be found in their resolutions, which "firmly yet respectfully" remonstrate against the departure of the Parent Society from that much-extolled principle upon which it was originally instituted? is it to be found in the earnest tone in which they urge the Bible Society to *return* to "the circulation of the *Holy Scriptures* without note or comment?" or is it to be found in their own determination, at all hazards, not to suffer themselves to be driven from this rock of strength?

It is impossible, one would think, that at this time of day there should be two opinions as to the nature of that bond of union, which has been the glory of the Bible Society, which has so often inspired the eloquence of its advocates, which has so often gladdened the hearts of the servants of God, and has caused even the gates of hell to tremble. Doubtless it consists in the belief of the truth of God's Word, and a desire to circulate nothing but his sacred oracles. This is the magic spell which has hushed the rebellious murmurs of party spirit, which has bound together Christians of every denomination, and, for the first time since the Reformation, urged them forward, not as formerly, in detached squadrons, but in one irresistible phalanx, against the embattled hosts of Satan. Claim inspiration for what is not the Word of God, or deny the

authority of the smallest portion of Holy Writ, and this bond of union must prove like a rope of sand. The Society was founded, as we are told in their first Prospectus, for the purpose of circulating\* “*nothing* but the inspired volume;” and they further made their appeal in their second Prospectus,† only to those “who profess to regard the Scriptures as the proper standard of faith.” These are *still* the principles of the Edinburgh Society, nor do I see how bigotry can be chargeable upon those who, in the prosecution of so glorious a design, acknowledge no distinction of nation, or sect, or party, but, going forth with the broad standard of Revelation unfurled, demand the co-operation of all who believe that the Bible is the Word of God, and “that the nations are given to the Redeemer as an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession.”

But here I am recalled to the consideration of the desperate argument by which, in default of all others, the Reviewer attempts to justify the conduct of the Parent Committee. “The simple ground,” says this writer, “on which we have been led to conclude that it is not unlawful to concur in the circulation of another canon than that which we, as Protestants, hold to be genuine, is this: that the Canon of Scripture is not an article of faith — is not a doctrine of Revelation, or a precept of Christ, which must be received and submitted to by all at the peril of their souls. Important, *in one sense* fundamentally important, as is the question relating to the canon, it is one that, after all, comes *within the range of human opinion and private judgment*.”.... Again, “Whether the declaration that ‘ALL SCRIPTURE is given by inspiration of God,’ can be safely extended to all books included in the Jewish canon — whether the whole of the *Chethubim* or *Hagiographa*,‡ though of undoubted genuineness and authenticity as historical documents, can be considered as indited by the Holy Ghost, and as forming part of the rule of faith, is *by no means so clear* as to warrant our demanding an unqualified assent and agreement from all Christian men.”.... “There is no inspired catalogue of the canonical books. Our own canon may possibly *include books not inspired*.”—Page 5, &c.

Had I not been in some measure prepared for this line of argument, by knowing that it had been occasionally suggested by some of the members of the Parent Committee, I should have been utterly confounded in finding it thus broadly stated in a Christian Review. Surely those who have adopted it, do not see the fearful

\* Owen’s History, vol. i. p. 35.

† Ibid. p. 65.

‡ That the reader may at once see upon how large a portion of Scripture doubt is thus thrown, it may be remarked, that the *Chethubim* or *Hagiographa* include the *whole of the Psalms*, the book of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, 1st and 2d Chronicles, Ezra, Esther, and that most important book, the prophecies of Daniel!! The triple distinction of the Jews is quite fanciful. Under “the Prophets,” or second division, are included Joshua, Judges, Ruth, &c., besides all the prophets except Daniel. This shews that in our Lord’s real classification, the historical books ought to be included under the Prophets, having been written by prophets.

precipice on which they stand, while thus loudly promulgating their uncertainty as to the inspiration of the Word of God. Surely it behoves the friends of the free circulation of the Apocrypha, to consider how far such zeal in their supporters is likely to carry them; and surely the Dissenters are especially bound to consider whether they are indeed so far degenerated from the Howes, the Owens, and the Baxters of other times, as by their silence to lend their sanction to principles in which unbelievers can alone find occasion of joy. Hitherto it has been the boast of Christians, that there is a majesty, a simplicity, and an authority in Scripture, which at once distinguish it from all other writings. It seemed like the fabled palace of Eastern Romance, whose pillars were so rich and costly, that a powerful prince exhausted his treasures in vainly endeavouring to add two to their number; but now it appears that these golden columns vary so little from the work of ordinary mortals, that it is almost impossible to distinguish what is human from divine. It will now, alas! no longer be necessary for infidels to ransack the writings of ancient blasphemers to furnish them with arguments against Revelation; it will no longer be necessary to renew the often-refuted assaults of the learned Porphyry, the apostate Julian, or the Manichean Faustus; the genius of Bolingbroke, the wit of Voltaire, the paradoxes of Rousseau, the subtlety of Hume, the sarcasms of Gibbon, or the coarseness of Tom Paine, will be no longer the only resort of those who seek to demolish the authority of the Bible. Scoffers will henceforth repair to the writings of the defenders of the Bible Society, and barb their arrows with the concessions of the champions of Christianity.

If it is at length conceded that the inspiration of "all Scripture" is uncertain, and that the authority of *any* part of it may be denied by Christians, it follows as an inevitable consequence that the divine authority of *every part* of it, in other words, of the whole Bible, must fall to the ground. If *every* component part of a building is weak, the whole fabric must be unstable. After having made such a concession, we might as well endeavour by a barrier of wood, to arrest the avalanche in its course, as it rolls with resistless force over rocks and precipices, as be able, by any nice distinctions of ours, to repair the mischief we have effected, or stop the flood-gate we have opened for the entrance of the enemy. I do not mean to assert that the canon of Scriptures, is a doctrine which must be submitted to by all, *at the peril of their souls*, but I do maintain that it is both "a doctrine of Revelation and a precept of Christ,"—that it is a grand and fundamental truth, to which we are bound by the authority of God to submit, and that in rejecting any part of this truth, we are exposing our souls to imminent hazard—that we are relinquishing a rock of adamant to abandon ourselves to quicksands and whirlpools. The blessed God has not revealed himself in his Word, and then left that Word exposed to the corruptions and additions of men. On the first day that man renounced his allegiance to his Creator, he did indeed receive a revelation of mercy; but it does not appear that the Almighty gave any written de-



claration of his will until he had separated a people from the rest of the nations, and appointed them to be the depositaries of his sacred oracles. That people, in the midst of their apostacy, rebellion, and wickedness, have never been suffered to betray their trust: the Old Testament has been preserved by them inviolate: amidst all the dreadful charges which our Lord urged against them, treachery in this respect was never hinted at, and it is indeed remarkable that, divided as the Jews were into different sects, there was never any difference among them respecting the authority of the writers of the Old Testament, and that at the present day nothing has a greater tendency to shock their prejudices and harden them against the truth, than the intermixture of Apocryphal and uninspired books with the Sacred Canon.

The New Testament was in like manner committed to Christians, and it is an instance of the providence of God worthy of notice, that while from the earliest ages, there were so many heresies and schisms, none of the Apocryphal books of the New Testament have obtained credit with any body of professed Christians; and all those books which are inspired were universally admitted and received by the Churches, without one dissentient voice, even before the decree of the council of Laodicea, in the year 363, which, as Paley remarks, “rather declared than regulated the public judgment,” and which, after all, was not of very extensive authority. Few of those books, which are now called Apocryphal, were allowed to be canonical even by the most unenlightened Papists till the ninth and tenth centuries, when, as it is remarked by the excellent Mr. Brown in his Dictionary of the Bible, “The ignorance of the people and the *villany* of the clergy were capable to allow any thing to pass for divine:” nor, says the same venerable writer, “was their divine authority established, but by the detestable Popish council of Trent, and by a few of the Papal dupes at Florence.” The British and Foreign Bible Society has been, however, requested to sanction this daring act of wickedness—an act, the injustice of which is so manifest, that it is on all sides acknowledged\* that the *learned* Catholics do not consider the Apocryphal books to be inspired. It might, therefore, have been expected, that the Bible Society would have replied to any demand that was made on them for an intermingled Apocrypha: “We dare not comply with your request; we can not do evil that good may come. You do indeed acknowledge that you do not consider the Apocrypha to be of divine authority, but the council of Trent, by whose decrees you have sworn to abide, has pronounced an anathema upon all who make any distinction between the Apocryphal and inspired books. We can not sanction this imposture; and we must compassionate your *ignorant* fellow-countrymen who have not the same means of information with yourselves. As Protestants we can not grant your

\* See Cambridge Remarks. St. Austin refused the authority of the Maccabees when quoted by the Circumcelliones to justify suicide; and St. Jerom calls all these books apocryphal.



request; as Christians we can not; and, in following this course, we anticipate even your approval in common with that of all honest and conscientious men." If such a line of proceeding had been adopted, it would not have been recorded in the history of the Church, that the Bible Society was the first body of Protestants who circulated the Apocrypha intermingled with the Word of God, and who have thus ceased to *protest* against the infamous decrees of the council of Trent.

Where, then, I would ask, is to be found the *uncertainty* of the inspiration of the Word of God, or where "the difference of opinion in the *Christian Church* respecting that canon?" The Reviewer altogether misrepresents the Protestant Churches on the Continent, when he alleges, that they understand the Apocrypha to be included in the Scriptures, (p. 11.) Fallen and apostate as are so many of the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches, they have not so far forgotten the principles of their illustrious founders, Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, and Calvin. For the Reviewer ought to have known that there is a difference between a book being almost uniformly bound up with the "Bible in the churches," and being considered as a part of the Bible. He might have known that in every copy of the Bible intended for the members of the Lutheran Church, the title of the spurious books, is "Apocrypha, that is, books which are NOT to be considered as equal to holy Scriptures!" If it is asked, what then becomes of the Catholic and Greek Churches? I reply, that no *Idolatrous Church* can be considered *Christian*, and in particular that the Romish Church is pointed out in the Apocalypse, in a way not to be mistaken as ANTI-CHRISTIAN, as the "mystery of iniquity," and the "mother of harlots:" I mean not to deny that there are many real Christians who belong to the Catholic Church—that there may be many who, like the 7000 in apostate Israel, have not bowed the knee to Baal, who live above its errors, and in the midst of abounding seductions, cleave to the true foundation of our hope, "justification by faith alone without works." But, I presume, there is nothing but the *dread of ecclesiastical censure*, which would prevent such persons from uniting in the circulation of the pure Word of God, for it will almost uniformly be found, that they reject the decree of the council of Trent, and, holding, in common with other Christians, that "the Bible and the Bible only contains the religion of Christ," discard these books which have been admitted by that council, notoriously for the sake of bolstering up the "damnable doctrines" of the mystical Babylon. It was for this reason, that the illustrious Calvin refused to answer a Papistical argument drawn from the Apocrypha, "lest he should appear to countenance their error in ascribing to it inspiration." It was for similar reasons, that Wickliff, and Luther, and Lonicerus, and Knox, and Cranmer, and Latimer, and Hooker, protested against treachery to the Scriptures in permitting human "to usurp the room and title of divine writings:" it was on this account that Chillingworth—however the Reviewer may attempt to stultify his meaning—asserted "that the Bible and the Bible *only* is the re-

ligion of Protestants:" and it was in the same spirit that Zuinglius, when he began his career at Zurich with the Bible in his hand, exclaimed, "This shall be my only stay; HERE are no fabulous legends, no fanatical notions and fabulous devotions; there is nothing to be found in it but what Eternal Wisdom teaches mankind to believe and do. Here we have a doctrine coming from God—the Gospel of Christ; and so infinitely important are its contents, that if an angel from heaven should preach unto you any other Gospel, he ought to be accursed."

Upon all these grounds, from which they can not be dislodged, it must appear that the Edinburgh Committee do not by their resolutions narrow that "basis" of union which ought to make the Society "a rallying point for all *Christians*." It is idle to think of laying a foundation for uniting the exertions of "Jews, Turks, and Infidels," as well as Christians; the Jew would not join a Society which intermingles the Apocrypha, far less one which annexes the New Testament; and we ought as little to listen to the man who desires the intermixture of the Apocrypha, as we should to the Infidel or Mussulman, who, to answer their own ends, demanded the intermixture or annexation of the Apocryphal gospels, or Alcoran.—The moment we depart from the principle of adhering to the received oracles of truth, that moment we introduce "occasions of controversy." Were it proposed therefore to annex the noblest works of Luther, or Calvin, instead of the errors and absurdities of the Apocrypha, the true friends of the Bible Society would then also be found at their post, ready to oppose the fatal innovation. It is therefore by an appeal to the uniting principle on which this great institution was founded, and to the exposition of that principle in the prospectus and publications of the Society, that the conduct of the Edinburgh Committee ought to be tried. If it can be shewn that they have attempted either to add to or diminish from the Word of God, then they have advocated principles subversive of the union of the Bible Society, and ought to be admonished to beware lest they subject themselves to the weight of that awful curse with which the Holy Spirit has closed the sacred canon. But if, on the other hand, it can be proved that the Edinburgh Committee have uniformly acted on a strict adherence to what is admitted to be the Word of God, without addition or diminution, then let their opponents beware, lest in condemning the zeal which they have displayed for the purity of the Holy Scriptures, they should themselves, in this respect, be found in arms against Him whose name is jealous, and who has solemnly declared, "Every word of God is pure. Add thou not unto his word, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."

II. *Precipitation*.—But there is another and a distinct charge which is brought against the Edinburgh Committee, namely, that of Precipitation. It is certainly not very material to the grand question at issue, whether the Edinburgh Committee have acted with caution and prudence, or with rashness and precipitation. But as they have appeared so conspicuous in the present con-

troversy, it will be satisfactory to the opponents of the Apocrypha, if it can be clearly shewn that these able coadjutors in this sacred cause have manifested wisdom and forethought, as well as uprightness and zeal. The Reviewer alleges, in the most unqualified terms, that the Edinburgh Society, "without trying the effect of any deputation to the Parent Committee, any personal remonstrance, *to use their own expression,*" (mark!) *'lost no time,'* after the receipt of the answer to their menacing resolution of April 4, in renouncing their connexion with the Society, and determining on the publication of their resolutions. *This eagerness and precipitation* in dissolving all friendly intercourse with the Parent Society, indicates that the previous feelings of the Edinburgh Committee could not have been very cordial. *We are not in possession of the secret history of these Resolutions; but we happen to know THAT AN ANGRY FEUD HAS LONG SUBSISTED BETWEEN THE EDINBURGH PRINTERS, AND THE ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES,* with regard to the circulation of Oxford and Cambridge Bibles in Scotland, and the exclusion of Scotch Bibles from this country. How far this cause of angry feeling may have extended its influence, WE CANNOT TELL."\* Page 14.

Not to disturb the Reviewer in his exultation over this ingenious discovery, allow me to ask, upon what principle of common honesty, not to say Christianity, did this writer presume to insert the words "lost no time," in the connexion in which they stand in the above paragraph? Was the writer at such a loss for topics of invective or censure as to be obliged to have recourse to misrepresentation in order to give a colour to his accusation? The words "lost no time," in the Edinburgh statement, not only do not refer to the Edinburgh Committee's renouncing all connexion with the London Society, but actually apply to a period *anterior* to the passing of "the menacing resolution of April 4." They are used (p. 13. Edinburgh Statement, 2d ed.,) solely in connexion with the resolution of the Parent Committee of the 21st of March, by which

\* It may seem almost ludicrous seriously to notice this insinuation; it cannot injure those against whom it is aimed, and must infallibly rebound upon its author. It may, however, be worth while to remark, in the *first* place, that the "angry feud" does not "subsist between the Edinburgh printers, and the English Universities," but between the King's printers for Scotland, and the King's and University printers in England. The King's printers in England have unfortunately succeeded in excluding the Scotch Bibles from this country, and in retaliation the King's printers in Scotland are attempting (and have succeeded in the courts below) to exclude English Bibles from Scotland. In the *second* place, in order to shew how far the Edinburgh Committee was likely to take part with the Scotch King's printers, it need only be remarked, that these monopolists have brought their action against the office-bearers of some of the *Scotch Bible Societies*, and that it is the members of the Edinburgh and other Societies who are resisting the assertion of this monopoly, the right of which still remains under appeal to the House of Lords. A most able "Memorial for the Bible Societies in Scotland, containing Remarks on the *Complaint of His Majesty's Printers,*" has been drawn up by the Rev. Dr. Lee, of Edinburgh, and published by the Edinburgh Bible Society. It displays the profoundest research, and brings together much curious and valuable information. Strange, that the Reviewer should thus expose his ignorance as well as his spleen!



the "whole question was again thrown open," when "the Committee of the Edinburgh Society lost no time," (not in renouncing connexion, &c.), but "in again taking up the subject." I would desire to avoid every thing like returning "railing for railing," but if I were to say that "no one who is not blinded by spleen, and maddened by party feeling," could have so misrepresented the Edinburgh Society, I think I should use these harsh words with more appearance of reason than the Reviewer.

But in order to prove how utterly unfounded is this charge of precipitation, let us advert to a few historical facts connected with the proceedings of the Edinburgh Committee, on the one hand, and with those of the Parent Institution on the other. It has been already noticed, that when the Bible Society was first established, it was fully understood, by the religious public, that its object was to circulate nothing but the Word of God. By a reference to its minute books, it appears, that, during the first eight or nine years of its existence, the Apocrypha was never *intermingled* with its editions of the Bible, and if it were, in any solitary instances, *annexed* by any of the foreign societies who received money from England, it was entirely without the sanction, if not without the knowledge of the London Committee. Nay more, when it was discovered that the Bohemian and various editions of the German Bible contained certain prefaces and glossaries with the Apocrypha, a resolution was made for the purpose of recalling the foreign societies to the recollection of "the necessity of carrying into effect the fundamental laws of the Society relative to the printing and circulating the Scriptures without note or comment;" and Dr. Steinkopff was afterwards instructed, during his continental tour in 1812, to urge the omission of the Apocrypha. It appears, however, that the Committee did not continue to adhere with firmness to their opposition to this innovation, for, on the 7th June, 1813, they yielded so far as to resolve not to interfere with "the manner of printing the Holy Scriptures by foreign societies, provided they be printed without note or comment." "This resolution," says Mr. Gorham, in his luminous and masterly statement, "seems to have been the *first* act of the Committee, by which they allowed the distribution, under their auspices, of an *annexed* Apocrypha, after *having expressly directed their attention to the subject*; but it does not appear, that they had yet sanctioned the objectionable form in which those writings assume the name and authority of the inspired Word of God, by being **INDISCRIMINATELY MINGLED** with the Holy Scriptures. This serious 'innovation' in the principles of the institution was soon followed, at the close of 1813, by extending pecuniary aid to the newly formed Moscow Bible Society;" \* the chief object of which was to print the *Sclavonian* Bible, which contains, in addition to the council of Trent's Apocryphal books, the 3d of Maccabees, and 3d of Esdras."

\* The second edition of the unanswerable and unanswered "Statement" of Mr. Gorham is well worthy the attention of every friend of the cause of the Bible.



These facts, although studiously suppressed in the reports and other publications of the Society, could not altogether remain concealed. The complaints and vain regrets of several faithful ministers on the Continent, who saw that the Society derived its information, in many cases, from quarters not the most favourable to orthodox sentiments on religion, would have been sufficient of themselves to force upon the friends of divine truth the melancholy reality. The barrier having been once broken down, no restraint was left on the operations of the Society in regard to the circulation of the Apocrypha, and in 1819, no less than four Apocryphal Bibles\* were ordered to be printed without retaining even the daggers by which the inspired used to be distinguished from the spurious books. At length it seemed necessary to consult as to the best method of recalling the Society to its original principles, and about four years ago several zealous friends of the Bible Society, unwilling to make the matter public, brought the subject before the Secretaries and some of the leading Members of the Committee. "Conversations," says Mr. Drummond, in a pamphlet distinguished for its talent and acuteness, "were then held privately with the Secretaries; they admitted the evil; *they confessed that the fundamental principle of the Society had been departed from*; but said, that they had now proceeded to such lengths, they did not know how to retrace their steps, and begged that nothing might be broached to the public, nor in the Committee. *Time was given them to deliberate*; they did so; and then said that by degrees the evil should be remedied. Under this impression the matter was allowed to rest." Preface, p. 2. About a year afterwards, it was discovered that the Apocrypha was still sanctioned and circulated by the Parent Society, and it was absolutely necessary to appeal to the Committee. This was indeed the more essential, because, as Mr. Gorham remarks, "the practice was introduced even *without the observation of some of the regular members of the Committee*; and so little was it known, that, at the close of 1824, *not a few among themselves* discredited it, as far as regards having made grants for printing *intermingled Apocryphas*!" p. 31. A special meeting, at which Lord Teignmouth presided, was held on the 19th of August, 1822, and after two long discussions a resolution was passed, which, though it did not accomplish all that was desired, was yet acquiesced in by the friends of the Society, both in London and Edinburgh, in order to avoid even the appearance of hostility.

Here I must be allowed to remark, that the Edinburgh Society had hitherto, *at least*, shewn no symptoms of precipitation. Many of its members were well acquainted with what was going forward, and were looking with anxiety to the result; some of them had, in the meantime, attended several of the meetings of the Parent Committee, and one of its Vice-Presidents had been among the number of those who *first* drew the attention of the Secretaries to the subject.

\* 1. The Italian, (Martini's); 2. Portuguese, (Pereira's); 3. Spanish, (Scio's); 4. French, (De Sacy's).

At this period also, Dr. Waugh—a man venerated for his age, his talents, and usefulness, and beloved for his amiable disposition and conciliating manners—assured the Committee that if a speedy termination were not put to the practice, all Scotland would move as one man against the adulteration of the Word of God. Still we see that with the greatest caution and forbearance the members of the Scotch Societies declined taking up the question as a body till the year 1824.

Subsequently to the passing of the resolution of 1822, a strong remonstrance was forwarded to London, from the MALTESE BIBLE SOCIETY, in reference to the distribution of an intermingled Apocrypha. The Maltese Committee did not take this step till after much and long deliberation, and after weighing well the effect of circulating the Bible without the assistance of human additions. I have heard from a gentleman who usually attends the meetings of the Committee, that this remonstrance—the first that was sent on the subject from any society—was never fully brought before the Parent Committee; but this is a fact for which I cannot vouch, and I can hardly imagine that any individuals, however excellent their motives, would take upon themselves the responsibility of withholding from the full consideration of the directors, a document of such peculiar importance, coming, as it did, from men of known zeal and devoted piety, living in a country where the tyranny of prejudice and superstition is, at least, as powerful as in any other quarter of the Papal world. At all events, much *displeasure* was manifested towards the Maltese Society, and instead of allowing the Apocryphal sheets to be cancelled, a letter was written to Malta, ordering the Catholic Bibles, with the spurious books intermingled, to be shipped off to another station.

Thus matters went on till the month of August 1824, when on the application of Dr. Leander Van Ess for authority to print his own translation of the Vulgate, with the Apocrypha interspersed, the Committee in Earl Street unanimously voted £500 for that object. The Edinburgh Society having been informed of this fact, and having now patiently waited for three years, without having seen any effectual steps taken by the London Committee to restrain the *intermixture*, and far less the *annexation* of the Apocrypha, at length resolved to protest, in their associated capacity, against the continuance of this practice. But they did not even now send forth their celebrated resolutions, but first of all protested against the grant to Leander Van Ess, and requested a copy of the resolutions respecting his version of the Old Testament. This, I understand, was refused, and instead of it a copy of Van Ess' letter was sent. The vote of £500, which we have already noticed, was indeed rescinded in consequence of an intimation by Lord Teignmouth that if this were not done, a protest would appear, in print, drawn up by a clergyman, who has all along distinguished himself, by the zeal as well as talent, with which he has opposed the intermixture of the Apocrypha, from the year 1821, during the life of Mr. Owen, down to the present time. Still it was obvious that the question

could not be allowed to rest on the basis of the resolution of 1822; and after some delay, and much discussion, a resolution was proposed by Lord Teignmouth, and *unanimously* carried, on the 20th of December, 1824, in one of the largest committees ever assembled, the purport of which was to restrain the society, altogether, from contributing to the publication of the Apocrypha interspersed, and to confine its grants to foreign societies, which annexed the Apocrypha to the printing of the canonical books only.

This resolution, although by far the best hitherto proposed, was by no means satisfactory to any party, and was particularly offensive to those who consider that it is sinful, in any shape, to contribute to the circulation of the Apocrypha. The question seemed however to be now shut up for ever, and the Bible Society was thus to furnish the continental societies with the means of applying the whole of their *own* funds to the printing of the Apocrypha—in other words, was indirectly to aid in the propagation of the works of false prophets. But the Edinburgh Society, having now patiently awaited the issue of a controversy of more than three years continuance, having frequently corresponded on the subject, and explained their own views, having further solemnly protested against the grant to Leander Van Ess—at length resolved, on the 17th of January, 1825, to forward to London their “respectful but firm remonstrance against the evil of which they complained.” Here we see no *precipitation*; there is no declaration of hostility, no determination abruptly to renounce their connexion with the Parent Institution; all is cool, calm, and deliberate expostulation, although the language of the resolutions is no doubt such as it befitted Christians to employ in addressing their brethren, whom they considered to be the unintentional instruments of a great evil. To this remonstrance no reply was sent, and the secretaries contented themselves with a simple acknowledgment of its receipt. But not only did the Edinburgh Committee transmit to London their subsequently printed resolutions, but, contrary to the assertion of the Eclectic Reviewer that they did not try the effect of any “personal remonstrance,” two of their most respected members\* personally waited on the secretaries; and one of them, at least, publicly explained in the Committee the views of his friends in the North, and their anxious desire that the Society should return to its fundamental rule. All this was, however, of no avail; and so far from shewing a disposition to meet the views of the Scotch Societies, there was an evident inclination, on the part of many of the members of the London Committee, to shake themselves free from the yoke of Lord Teignmouth’s resolution.† This feeling was remarkably

\* The Rev. Dr. Lee, and John Campbell, esq., of Carbrook.

† I understand his lordship disclaims being the author of this resolution, and considers that the Bible Society *cannot* circulate the Apocrypha. His lordship is also reported to have made use of the following simple but conclusive syllogism:—“The Bible Society cannot circulate any thing but the Holy Scriptures; the Apocrypha is not the Holy Scriptures, therefore the Bible Society cannot circulate the Apocrypha.”



displayed on the 7th of March, when another protest against this resolution was received from Cambridge, but on grounds totally opposed to those on which the Edinburgh remonstrance was founded. This paper was signed by Mr. Venn and twenty-five other members of the University of Cambridge, but nine of them at least were non-resident; and such was the hasty manner in which it was got up, that several of the subscribers have since declared, that they would not have been so rash, if they had understood the real nature of the question in dispute. It was, then, on the 7th of March that this protest was received, and on the 7th of March, without any previous intimation, Mr. Brandram, the secretary, unexpectedly rose, at the conclusion of a long discussion, at a late hour of the day, and requested a member to move, that not only Lord Teignmouth's, but all the previous resolutions respecting the Apocrypha, should be instantly rescinded. To the astonishment of the Committee themselves, the motion was carried by acclamation, and thus was the fruit of much thought and anxious deliberation, in a hasty moment, given to the winds.

Of this proceeding the Edinburgh Committee were apprised on the 4th of April, and instead of determining now to break off from the Parent Society, they received the information with satisfaction, inasmuch as "the whole question was again thrown open." They accordingly "lost no time," in once more putting themselves in correspondence with the Earl Street Committee. In answer to their communications, they received a letter not even officially signed by the secretaries, simply enclosing an extract, from the Minute Book of the resolution of April 9th, of which a most faithful and distinguished minister on the Continent lately remarked, that it was so ambiguous that it reminded him of the answer of the Genevan ministers to D'Alembert, when he represented them as Socinians in the French Encyclopédie. One thing was clear in this resolution, that the British and Foreign Bible Society was no longer restrained from sending out the canonical books *in parts*, printed in such a manner as to allow the intermixture of the Apocrypha. For men who entertained a conscientious opinion as to the unlawfulness of thus directly countenancing, and indirectly aiding in the circulation of the Apocrypha, there remained but one firm and decided course.

The Edinburgh Committee had now tried all that could be attempted, in the way of private remonstrance. All their correspondence, all their resolutions, all their personal interviews, had produced no effect. Their remonstrance of the 17th January had been treated with silent indifference, if not with contempt: a considerable part of it was not even *read* in the Committee; and when, after the lapse of a considerable time, an answer was again requested by the Edinburgh Society, it was again determined that no answer could be given. Another and more formal communication is once more made to the Parent Society, in the shape of a resolution, urging the necessity of a decisive reply; and a copy of the unsatisfactory resolution of the 9th April, not even signed by the secretaries, is deemed a sufficient mark of respect, to a society which had contri-



buted so largely to the cause of the Bible.\* There remained therefore for the Edinburgh Society, on the one hand, either to retire from the Parent Society, and suffer it to moulder into ruins by the defection of its auxiliaries and subscribers, or, on the other hand, to sound an alarm, and exhort all who valued the purity of the Word of God and the uniting principle of the Society, to come forward, and by their firmness and decision at this critical juncture, save from destruction the noblest institution in the world. If the latter alternative was adopted, they were sure of the co-operation of the whole of Scotland; nor has experience proved that they were mistaken when they imagined that their southern brethren would not be less zealous than themselves in opposing an innovation on the laws of the Society, which they conceived to be so fraught with mischief, and so contrary to the express commands of the Almighty. It was not, however, till the 18th of May that they finally resolved to adopt this measure, nine days subsequent to the date of Mr. Venn's Cambridge Remarks, nor was the Edinburgh Statement in circulation, till after the former publication, in its original form, had been printed.†

Thus we see that the charge of *precipitation* brought by the Eclectic Reviewer against the Edinburgh Committee, is utterly groundless, and proceeds entirely from ignorance of the fact, that four years had elapsed during which the question had deeply engaged the attention of many of its members; that at least five or six months of correspondence with the London Committee had elapsed before the resolutions of the 17th January were forwarded to London; that it was not till after four months more, and an intermediate monitory resolution, and not till the Cambridge Remarks were prepared, that the Edinburgh Society adopted the decided but **DELIBERATE MEASURE**, which has naturally proved so obnoxious to the upholders of the Apocrypha. Time will shew whether or not the Edinburgh Committee is destined to be the instrument, under God, of restoring to the Society its original uniting principle, and thus placing it on a rock from which it shall never be moved. Should this be the case, I doubt not but that the same persons who now so bitterly condemn their proceedings, will be the first to express their gratitude to those upon whom they now look with feelings of indignation.

III. *Misrepresentation*. — I trust that it has been satisfactorily

\* The Edinburgh Society had not only largely contributed to the circulation of the Word of God through other channels, but had, in the course of fourteen years, advanced £22,000 to the Parent Institution.

† The Resolutions of the 18th of May were carried almost unanimously—there being only *three* dissentient voices in a most numerous Committee. The three respected members who dissented, although averse to strong measures, were also decided in opposing the circulation of the Apocrypha. Among other valued and eminent names we find the following in the majority:—THE REV. DOCTORS DAVIDSON, DICKSON, GORDON, LEE, AND A. THOMPSON; THE REV. W. TAIT; THE REV. PROFESSOR PAXTON; THE REV. E. CRAIG, A.M. OXON; AND J. CAMPBELL, R. HALDANE, J. A. HALDANE, R. HEPBURN, AND GEORGE ROSS, ESQUIRES, &c. &c.

proved, that in opposing either the addition or intermixture of the Apocrypha with the Bible, the Edinburgh Society was acting in a manner perfectly consistent with the most liberal principles; and farther, that in their mode of conducting this opposition they have betrayed no *precipitation*. It remains to consider whether the Statement they have published is justly chargeable either with *misrepresentation* or *intemperance*. The misrepresentations of which the Reviewer complains are of a double character: first, as they regard the character of the Apocryphal books; secondly, as they regard the conduct of the London Committee in respect to their circulation. I shall consider both of these charges.

1. As to the character of the Apocryphal books, I cannot do better than cite the excellent resolution of the Edinburgh Committee, which has been made by the Reviewer the object of his most "immodest invectives:"—

"That the British and Foreign Bible Society is not only altogether prohibited by the law of its existence from giving any sanction to the circulation of the Apocrypha, but that it cannot do this without incurring the guilt, of putting a most fearful fraud upon the world, and laying a deadly snare for the souls of men; because the Apocrypha is not only an uninspired book, and therefore on a level with other human productions, but far below the level of many human compositions, as it is abundantly interspersed with falsehoods, false doctrines, superstitions, and contradictions of itself and of the Word of God, of which a few specimens are annexed; and because these Apocryphal writings, laden as they are with such gross and palpable error, do advance a deceitful claim to reverence and attention, upon the pretext of being inspired; so that in whatever degree the influence of the British and Foreign Bible Society has tended to encourage the circulation of these Apocryphal writings, it has gone out of its direct course, to sanction a human composition replete with error, which wickedly assumes to be a revelation from Heaven; and that this Society deeply regrets that the use of such strong language, as appears in the Reports of the Parent Society, respecting the exclusive circulation of Holy Scripture, should have been accompanied by the distribution of the Apocrypha appended to the Scriptures, inasmuch as it has been an indirect expression to the world of an opinion which the Society certainly did not and could not entertain, that the claim of these writings to inspiration is not altogether unfounded."—*Edinburgh Statement*.

Having quoted the above resolution, the Reviewer assumes a tone of more decided invective. He accuses the Edinburgh Committee of "*gross mis-statement*," in alleging that the Apocryphal books "wickedly assume to be a revelation from Heaven," and emphatically demands, "where is this pretext put forward?" With undoubting confidence he appeals to the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, and considers his assertions incontrovertible after he has referred to the conclusion of the 2d Maccabees. He seems to imagine that the framers of the Edinburgh Statement have altogether overlooked the manifest distinction, between a claim to inspiration advanced on

the part of the Apocryphal writers, and one advanced for them by the Council of Trent. "What," he exultingly exclaims, "becomes, then, of the broad assertion in the Edinburgh Statement, that the Apocryphal writings are counterfeit and heterodox, and pretend to inspiration?" He is astonished that "*any respectable body of men* could concur in passing a statement so extravagant," and sarcastically recommends "the Council of Edinburgh to pay a little more attention to the correctness of their decrees." Here the Reviewer betrays entire ignorance of his subject, substituting the language of invective for reasoning, and unmeaning banter for sound logic. But let us calmly examine the force of his assertions. Granting that the books of Ecclesiasticus and 2d Maccabees lay no claim to inspiration, what becomes of the remaining twelve? Does the author of the Wisdom of Solomon assert no claim to inspiration, when he speaks in the character of the Royal Prophet, but with the inconsistency that belongs to falsehood, cites numerous passages from Isaiah and Jeremiah, prophets who flourished centuries after the death of Solomon? Is it a "gross mis-statement" to consider those passages which are interpolated in the books of Daniel and Esther, as putting forward a claim to be considered as inspired, when it is remembered they are altogether *fabulous*, and yet profess to relate a part of sacred history? But these and similar claims are weak compared with those advanced in the books of Esdras. Let us turn to the 1st chapter of 2d Esdras, and observe how he commences his narration, "AND THE WORD OF THE LORD CAME UNTO ME, SAYING." Again, in the 2d chapter, v. 1, it is written, "THUS SAITH THE LORD;" and again, "THUS SAITH THE LORD TO ESDRAS." Seven times in this single chapter is made this direct claim to inspiration. Again, in the 3d chapter, v. 30. "I, ESDRAS, RECEIVED A CHARGE OF THE LORD ON MOUNT OREB THAT I SHOULD GO TO ISRAEL." Will the writer in the Eclectic Review now presume to charge the Edinburgh Committee with the guilt of "A GROSS MIS-STATEMENT" in alleging that the Apocryphal books "wickedly assume to be a Revelation from Heaven?"

But not satisfied with denying that these writings "pretend to inspiration," the Reviewer, forgetting his own admissions a few pages before, is indignant that they should be charged with "heterodoxy." "There is," he asserts, "a tone of exaggeration" about the condemnatory resolution which "betrays any thing but a cool head and an *honest heart*." "The specimens of '*lies and falsehood*,' '*low and vulgar puerilities*,' '*gross errors and immoralities*,' '&c., which are culled and printed in the Edinburgh Statement, are 'by no means such as warrant the sweeping reprobation and the '*vulgar* accumulation of *coarse* epithets bestowed on these writings. 'Indeed, some of the citations are made with so little discretion, that 'it must strike any intelligent reader, that the *Old Testament itself* 'would furnish many passages capable of being exhibited in a light 'scarcely less equivocal, in the hands of Paine and Carline.'" We may be grieved at such an assertion, but it is less astonishing after the previous avowal of opinions which undermine the authority of



the whole sacred volume. It is indeed true, as Bishop Watson somewhere remarks, that "by stringing together detached sentences, an Ausonius may compel the chaste Virgil to furnish materials for an indecent poem; and from the Bible itself, a system of impiety might, by such means, be extracted:" but allow me to ask, could Carlile or Paine, or any other perverter of Scripture, hope to discover in the Bible "*falsehoods*" such as those contained in the Wisdom of Solomon; "*puerilities*" so contemptible as the story of Tobit and his Dog; "*absurdities*" so glaring as those recorded in the fable of Bel and the Dragon; "*immorality*" so shocking as the recommendation of suicide in the 2d Maccabees, xiv. 41—46, and of assassination in the book of Judith; "*errors*" so fatal as the doctrine of the invocation of saints, of purgatory, prayers for the dead; and so utterly subversive of the Gospel as those of personal merit and justification by works? Surely, if the Reviewer had not been hurried forward by the impulse of mistaken zeal, he would not have been betrayed into expressions, which ill comport with the reverence due to a book, the whole of which, an apostle tells us, is the wisdom and power of God. How different from the language of the Reviewer is the beautiful remark of Bishop Jewell, "The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth purified seven times. There is no sentence, no clause, no word, no syllable, no letter, but it is written for thy instruction; there is not one jot, but is sealed and signed with the blood of the Lamb. Our imaginations are idle, our thoughts are vain; there is no *idleness*, no *vanity* in the Word of God."

Supposing, however, that all the passages cited from the Apocrypha by the Edinburgh Committee were insufficient, does the Reviewer imagine that there were not a multitude of other proofs to be found in these writings amply sufficient to substantiate every charge? Does he suppose that the gentlemen who drew up the Statement, had so ill considered their case, as to assert upon slight grounds that "the whole work is replete with instances of vanity, flattery, idle curiosity, affectation of learning, and other blemishes; with frivolous, absurd, false, superstitious, and contradictory statements?" No! If the character of every individual member of the Edinburgh Committee were not a sufficient guarantee against such an instance of weakness, that of a learned Professor, well known to the world as the author of a valuable work in illustration of the Bible from Oriental customs, who is

\* The Reviewer, in a note, endeavours to dispose of a number of the passages quoted from the Apocrypha in the Edinburgh Statement, by saying that they are not very different from some contained in Scripture. One of these is Esther, x. 6, which the Reviewer asserts is not more absurd than Gal. iv. 25. To give a colour to this criticism, the apostle should have written, "This Mount Sinai is Agar," instead of "This Agar is Mount Sinai." But what shall we say to the Reviewer's considering 2 Esdras, viii. 33, "The just *shall out of their own deeds receive reward*," as parallel to Rev. xiv. 13! And why does he omit the following passage, quoted by the Edinburgh Statement, "*Thou hast not appointed repentance unto the just, as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which have not sinned against thee?*" The Reviewer's criticisms will be found equally unfair by an examination of the texts he has referred to, but not quoted.



reported to have furnished the proofs contained in the Appendix, would be sufficient to rescue the Statement from such an imputation. But let us refer to some authorities to prove that the Edinburgh Committee are amply borne out in their assertions by the highest names, both ancient and modern. In the celebrated Apology of the Lincolnshire Ministers, presented to James I., in 1604, it is said, "Forasmuch as the Apocryphal books contain *sundry manifest errors*." In 1618, the Synod of Dort declared that the Apocrypha contained "*doctrines and narratives opposed to the canonical books*." The pious and devout Bishop Hall unequivocally says of the Apocryphal books: "whereof yet some purpose to their readers, no better than *magical jugglings*; others BLOODY SELF-MURDERS; others LYING fables; and others HEATHENISH rites; not without a public applause in their relation." (Hall's Polemical Works, p. 60.) And to cite less ancient, but scarcely less important testimony, that devoted man of God, Mr. Brown, the author of the Family Bible, among other strong censures, observes, "Every attentive reader must perceive that these books want the majesty of inspired Scripture, and that there are in them a variety of things WICKED, FALSE, and DISAGREEABLE TO THE ORACLES OF GOD." (Dictionary of the Bible. Article "Apocrypha.") That able and judicious Commentator, Thomas Scott, also speaks of the "palpable errors" of the Apocrypha; and that learned and valuable writer, the Rev. Mr. Hartwell Horne, remarks, "The Apocryphal writings contain many things which are *fabulous, contradictory* to historical truth, and directly at variance with the Canonical Scriptures!" Nay, the Reviewer himself, at the *outset* of his pamphlet, and before he had got warmed with his subject, speaks of "their positively exceptionable parts," "spurious additions," "unscriptural doctrine," "absurdity," "*indelicacy*," "errors," "false example," and "false instruction!" It would be easy to accumulate authorities concurring with the Edinburgh Committee, but surely authorities are not wanted to prove the dangerous tendency of books which are uniformly quoted by Papists in support of some of their most fatal errors; — books which are employed to prove that there are other *mediators* than the "one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus;" — books which teach, that some at least, of the race of Adam, stand in no need of the imputed righteousness of Christ, and by expressly inculcating the doctrine of purgatory, derogate from the glory of that one sacrifice for sin, once offered, that perfects for ever them that are sanctified; — books which assume to themselves the character of inspiration, and issue forth their false visions and prophecies with "Thus saith the Lord." We are not at liberty to parley with men as to the estimation in which these writings are to be held. On the authority of an Apostle we are bound to hold them "accursed." Gal. i. 8, 9. Hear also the Prophet Ezekiel: "Thus saith the Lord, Woe unto the *foolish prophets* that follow their own spirit! Have ye not seen a vain vision, and have ye not spoken a lying divination, whereas ye say 'The Lord saith it.'

*Therefore*, thus saith the Lord, Mine hand shall be upon the prophets that see vanity, and that divine lies: THEY SHALL NOT BE IN THE ASSEMBLY OF MY PEOPLE, NEITHER SHALL THEY BE WRITTEN IN THE WRITINGS OF THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL." Ezek. xiii. 2, 9.

But there is another and a distinct kind of misrepresentation of which "the Edinburgh Seceders" are said to be guilty. It is alleged that "the Parent Committee have been loudly and most unjustly charged with a breach of faith, in departing from their original laws, and violating their covenant with the Christian public." The Edinburgh Committee do indeed, in common with thousands, think that the Parent Committee have transgressed the fundamental laws of the Society in printing and circulating the Apocrypha. But is there any misrepresentation in this? No one charges the Parent Committee with improper motives. But how honourable and benevolent soever were these motives, is it not a notorious fact that so generally was it understood that the Rules of the Society prohibited the circulation of any thing but the Word of God, that till the fact was published by the Cambridge and Edinburgh Statements, few of the country subscribers knew that any part of their money was otherwise employed? But the Reviewer endeavours to establish it as a fact, that the great body, of the members of the Society, have all along *mistaken* the meaning of the fundamental law, and that the Committee were by that law entitled to print and circulate any writings which any body of men, calling themselves Christians, choose to incorporate with the sacred Scriptures.

Unhappily for this line of argument, it can be incontrovertibly established, that if this be really the fact, the Projectors of the Society have been very unfortunate in the choice of their words, for it is unanimously declared by the survivors, the Rev. J. Pratt, the Rev. Dr. Bogue, the Rev. I. Townsend, the Rev. J. Hughes, and Mr. Z. Macauley, that the rules were expressly framed with the view of excluding the Apocrypha. Mr. Hughes does not indeed so perfectly recollect whether foreign operations were contemplated in framing the rule so as to exclude the Apocrypha. But this circumstance does not weaken our confidence, in the memory and opinion of his able coadjutors, more especially when we remember that the Society was, from the first, called a Foreign as well as a British Society, and that the other rules almost equally apply to foreign and domestic operations. In addition to testimony so unequivocal, let us turn to the Prospectus, which must, by every principle of equity as well as law, be held to confine within its terms the powers of the Association. It is said in the first Prospectus, "The projected Society, presenting *nothing* but the *inspired* volume, would be sure to circulate truth, and *truth alone*; hereby *avoiding the occasions of controversy*, and opening a channel into which Christians of every name might, without scruple, pour their charitable contributions." And, in their second Prospectus, those

only are invited to join the Society "who profess to regard the *Scriptures as the proper standard of faith.*" But if this be not sufficient to overwhelm this charge of misrepresentation on the part of the Edinburgh Committee, let us now refer to the resolution—the unanimous and deliberate resolution of the Parent Committee, in August 1822, where it is said, "The attention of the Committee having been called to the fundamental rule of the Society, as limiting the application of its funds to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, and it appearing that THIS VIEW OF THE SAID RULE HAS BEEN TAKEN FROM THE BEGINNING BY THE GREAT BODY OF ITS MEMBERS; the Committee, anxious on the one hand to keep entire good faith with all the members of the Society, and on the other to maintain unimpaired, the friendly intercourse which it has had the happiness so long to hold with Bible Societies which circulate books esteemed *Apocryphal* in this country, &c."

In opposition to the plainest interpretations of the law; in opposition to the testimony of the projectors of the Society; in opposition to the solemn declaration of the Committee themselves, the Reviewer endeavours to prove that the Society is not prohibited by their laws from circulating Apocryphal books. And how does he purpose to establish his position? simply by endeavouring to prove that the words "AUTHORISED VERSION" include the Apocrypha! Now, granting for a moment, that the words "authorised version" do *legally* include the Apocrypha, would such an interpretation commend itself to the conscience of upright men, who act not upon the principles of the world, nor upon those by which the dishonesty of men compel judicial authorities to act? And, in the next place, would these words be sufficient *in law* to outweigh the explanation they receive, not only from the context but from the prospectus, by which the directors of every association are strictly bound to frame their subsequent regulations? But fortunately, we are not reduced to have recourse to these arguments, for in answer to the question of the Reviewer, "What does the authorised version include?" we answer, the Old and New Testaments. And if the Reviewer again asks, "Does it or does it not contain the Apocrypha?" we answer decidedly, No; and the correctness of the denial may be substantiated in various ways. The simplest proof would be a reference to the title-page of any Bible within whose boards are contained the Apocrypha: the title is "The Holy Bible, containing"—the Reviewer's triple division?—no; "containing the Old and New Testaments." And to cut off all ground for asserting that the Apocrypha is a part of the Old Testament, if we turn the page and refer to the Table of Contents, we find the Apocrypha is placed by itself, in a distinct division. But, says the Reviewer again, "What are the Holy Scriptures appointed to be read in Churches?" In answer to this question, we have as little difficulty in proving from the MIRROR and other ancient law authorities that the term "Holy Scriptures" includes only the *canonical* books of the Old and New Testament. The statute, 9th and 10th William III. c. 32, also limits the term "Holy Scriptures" to mean the Old and New Testament. Now



the Bible Society was formed for the purpose of circulating "the *authorised version*" of what?—of the *Holy Scriptures* and APOCRYPHA? Certainly not; but "the authorised version of the Holy Scriptures." It is vain for the Reviewer to argue that the sixth\* article of the Church of England, or the Prayer Book, proves that the Apocryphal writings are included in the Holy Scriptures. The article would never suggest such an idea to a plain man who went to it for information as to the opinion of the Church of England; and in a passage quoted by Mr. Gorham from the Preface to the Prayer Book, it is expressly said, "Nothing is *ordained to be read*, but the very pure Word of God, the Holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the same."†

It is true there is also an *authorised version* of the Apocrypha, but surely, as the celebrated Lord Hardwicke used to say, "There is no magic in words," nor can the circumstance of a version being made by Royal authority, in any way cause it to be considered as a part of the Scriptures.‡ There is, however, not merely an authorised version of the Apocrypha, but it is "appointed to be read in Churches." But does this circumstance confer any additional claim on the Apocrypha? There is a statute, the 19th Geo. II. c. 21, against profane swearing. This act is not only, like all others, printed exclusively by Royal authority, but it is also expressly "appointed to be read in Churches." Would the Reviewer consider this act to be a part of Scripture? It may be true, that in five cases out of ten a large quarto Bible would be returned if unaccompanied by the Apocrypha; but so also in *nine* cases out of ten, would any Scotch Bible be returned, which was not accompanied by the Psalms in metre! It is useless to prolong an argument upon a point so clear, but it may also be remarked, as a circumstance which seems to have escaped the observation of those who have made use of this argument, that by no *possibility* can the words "authorised version" be considered as embracing the Apo-

\* It is indeed true that the article authorises the books which are said not to be "canonical" to be read "for instruction of life and example of manners;" but this seems to have been permitted by the great champions of the reformation rather in accommodation to the prejudices of their age: for, says Bishop Hall, "surely, there may be many precepts in *Syracides*, the *counterfeit* Solomon, and *Esdras*, which savour of excellent wisdom: but I wonder what kind of good manners can be learned from such like histories. Well may I say of these, as that Chian servant of his master which sold his wine and drank his lees, While they have good they seek for naught."

† See an able article by Mr. Gorham, in the *Christian Guardian* for October.

‡ The Reviewer imagines that if there had not been a separation of the Apocrypha made at the Reformation, there could have been no Bible Society, unless the Society published an intermingled Apocrypha. If there had been no separation, it is very probable there would have been no Bible Society; but the Reviewer is mistaken in supposing that the royal monopoly would have prevented it. Had the Printer refused to give the Bible without the Apocrypha, nothing would have been simpler than to have altered the present version or added new marginal references. The translation belongs to the King in the same way that a translation of the Odes of Horace would belong to the King if made by royal authority. The only difference between the *copyright* of an individual and of the crown, is, that the King never dies, and possesses it for ever.



crypha in Scotland, inasmuch as it is not there "appointed to be read in Churches," but was wisely discarded by the illustrious reformers of the Church of Scotland, and is not there looked upon with more veneration than the Talmud or Alcoran.\*

It is further urged by many, that as the object of the Society is declared to be "to encourage a wide circulation of the Holy Scriptures," *therefore* it is lawful to circulate the Apocrypha. If this reasoning be good for any thing, it will equally justify the addition of the mass-book on the Continent, and the Koran in Turkey. Why has the Society been precluded from sending Bibles into Austria, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, where they might have found an entrance, accompanied by notes and comments? The Reviewer, indeed, goes further on this subject than some of his friends will think altogether consistent with a proper feeling of reverence for Revelation; for he not only scouts with indignation the idea of the Apocrypha being "a deadly snare for the souls of men," as an opinion more worthy of Rome than Edinburgh, but he boldly asserts, "If the whole efficacy of the Word of God can thus easily be neutralised by being accompanied with a few books of an uncanonical character, it would really seem a doubtful matter, whether its circulation under any form can be safe or beneficial. This charge reflects less on the Bible Society than on the Bible," p. 14. After reading these, and the many similar passages, with which this widely circulated paper abounds, one can not but exclaim, Is this the reverence that is due to God's Word! The Holy Spirit has vouchsafed to guard this Word from adulteration by denouncing vengeance against the man who shall presume to add to it, and shall we, trusting in our wisdom, dare to reply that "If the whole efficacy of the Word of God can thus easily be neutralised, it would really seem a doubtful matter, whether its circulation under any form can be safe or beneficial!" Far different was the language of the venerable Bishop Hall, when he said, "We know full well how great impiety it is to fasten upon the God of heaven the weak conceptions of a human wit: neither can we be any whit moved with the idle crack of the Tridentine curse, while we hear God thundering in our ears, 'If any man add unto these words, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book.' Neither know I, whether it be more wickedly audacious to fasten on God those things which he never wrote, or to weaken the authority and deny the sufficiency of what he hath written."† Well might a writer on the present controversy, whom we have already quoted,

\* The commission granted to the King's Printer in England, confers on him the privilege of printing "Bibles and New Testaments," also "all books of common prayer and administration of the sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church of England;" "and also all other books whatsoever which we, &c. have commanded, &c. to be used for the service of God in the Churches, &c." But in the patent granted to the King's Printer in Scotland there is no clause corresponding to that just quoted in reference to *other books* used for divine service; because the Apocrypha is never read in the Churches in Scotland.

† Hall's "No Peace with Rome," c. ii. § 4. — Polemical Works, p. 60.

exclaim, "Oh into what wretched dilemmas do we bring ourselves when we begin to explain away clear and unqualified commands; when expediency is brought in battle-array against consistency, simplicity, and obedience." "*Ye shall NOT add unto my Word, saith the Lord. Ye may add a little to gain a great good, saith Satan.*"

But to draw this discussion to a close, and shew how unjustly the Edinburgh Committee have been accused of misrepresenting the original design of the British and Foreign Bible Society, permit me to call your attention to a few additional proofs on the subject. For example, after all the ingenious arguments that have been adduced, to prove that the Bible Society may circulate books that are confessedly uninspired—after every word, nay even the *letters* of the fundamental rule have been tortured, for the purpose of extracting a meaning imperceptible to vulgar eyes—it is really refreshing to meet such a passage as the following, quoted from the second prospectus of the Society, by Mr. Dudley,\* in his Analysis of the Bible Society: "The Institution is thus founded on a principle so *intelligible* and so unexceptionable, that persons of any description, who profess to regard the Holy Scriptures as the proper standard of faith, may cordially and conscientiously join in it, and in the spirit of true Christian charity, harmoniously blend their common endeavours to promote the glory of God." Mr. Dudley again remarks, "If the circulation of *any uninspired production* were included in this object, a difference must necessarily exist, and doubts and difficulties impede the progress of the Society; but in restricting it to the dissemination of the sacred volume *alone*, and embracing the world as its sphere of action, it asserts no common claim to the support of all who believe the Bible to be a revelation from God." Various proofs are afterwards adduced to shew that the Society has "preserved this principle inviolate." Again, it is said in the Report for 1823, p. 80, "The British and Foreign Bible Society, in its endeavours to demolish the strong holds of infidelity and superstition, *can employ* only the Sword of the Spirit;" and in the same volume, the following words are quoted: "We can not, we dare not *add* one jot or tittle to these books, nor take one away," p. 37. Is it alleged that the Apocrypha is the sword of the Spirit, and no *addition* to the sacred volume? After this mass of evidence, as well as to the meaning of the laws of the Society, as to the manner in which it professed and intended to act, how can the Edinburgh Society be accused of misrepresentation, in alleging that the circulation of the Apocrypha is a departure from the "original covenant with the Christian public?"

The fact that the Society circulated the Apocrypha was studiously kept out of view. The Reports were drawn up so as to exclude all reference to the subject; letters were printed *and passages struck out*,† "doubtless," says Mr. Gorham, "because it

\* Dudley's Analysis, p. 4.

† The Report for 1813, p. 3, compared with the minute-book, shews that the following words are struck out, "if the Königsburg Committee were to

was thought dangerous to agitate it." Well may the same judicious writer observe, "The present controversy may shew the impolicy of any individuals, however distinguished for wisdom or piety, having taken on themselves such a fearful responsibility." At all events, the public had never been allowed to imagine that the fundamental principle, of the Society, had been so entirely forgotten, or its meaning so strangely mistaken, until about four years ago the truth was forced on the attention of some of the friends of the Bible; and I cannot but flatter myself, that it will appear to every impartial person, that a charge more unfounded, and more untenable, was never conceived, than that of misrepresentation in this respect, on the part of the Edinburgh Committee.\*

IV. *Intemperance.* The only remaining charge against the Edinburgh Committee is that of intemperance;—a charge on which we might have imagined that the Reviewer, of all others, would, on the present occasion, have been silent. "The temper and spirit," it is said, "which pervade the statement, are but too visible in all their proceedings." The writer afterwards speaks of "the rash and intemperate conduct of the Edinburgh Seceders," and scruples not to assert that "they have acted under strong irritation and vindictive feeling," &c. I trust I have already successfully proved, that the general proceedings of the Committee at Edinburgh have been the result, of patient and mature deliberation, and that in circulating their statement, they adopted a course differing but little from that of the Apocryphal party at Cambridge. It remains, however, to examine into the nature of the Edinburgh statement, and to inquire how far it merits the invectives of the Eclectic Reviewer. I am aware that in the present day, this charge of intemperance is one which is sometimes admitted upon grounds altogether erroneous, and that it is too frequently the fashion, to drown the arguments of a troublesome opponent, by the cry of a *bad spirit*. Meekness and gentleness are such cardinal virtues in the religion of Christ, that the very suspicion of their absence will necessarily create a prejudice against

omit the Apocrypha, it would render the edition unacceptable."—See Mr. Gorham's Pamphlet, p. 27.

\* In the year 1818, Mr. Owen, at the Public Meeting of the Bible Society, in a speech since printed, made use of the following remarkable expressions: "I assure the *Rev. Secretary from Scotland*, in the hearing of this great assembly, that no language he has used, or can use, would be too strong to express our attachment to our fundamental regulation, and our resolution to maintain it to the uttermost. To err is human; to retract an error is, I had almost said, more than human. This much, however, I will assert, that if any thing should appear on the face of our transactions, which does not approve itself to the ~~Scriptures~~ and honourable judgment of our friends, not only in SCOTLAND, but in any part of the world, so far from evincing an obstinate adherence to any measures we may be thought to have erroneously adopted, we will retrace our steps, revoke our decisions, and if that appear expedient, even revoke and rescind them, rather than hazard the smallest infringement of that principle of union which binds us together. *If, therefore, adherence to our principles can retain Caledonia in our interest, I feel convinced that we shall never lose the benefit of her co-operation, nor the tribute of her gold.*" Time will prove how far Mr. Owen's pledge is likely to be redeemed.



the soundest reasoning, in the minds of those, who desire in all things, to follow the example of their Divine Master. But at the same time it must be remembered, that an accusation ought not to have any weight, unless supported by evidence; that we ought to distinguish things that differ, and not to account firmness and zeal for the truth as symptoms of a "*bad spirit*." Let us remember that the Apostle Paul did not consider even the age and distinguished zeal and holiness of Peter, sufficient to protect him from open rebuke, but that he "withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed." Let us recollect that the Apostle John—the beloved disciple—the apostle of charity—has not escaped the charge of a "*bad spirit*;" that his language, when speaking of the Gnostics, in his 2d epistle, and of the turbulent Diotrephes in his 3d, has in both cases been deemed open to attack, and that some have even thought it necessary, for the sake of defending his character, to question the historical fact of his having fled from the presence of the heretic Cerinthus, as a man to be shunned as a pestilence. We have divine authority for saying that we ought "to contend earnestly for the truth," and the spiritually minded Milner, a man not deficient in Christian meekness, exhorts Christians, in the present age of false candour, zealously to maintain the principles of sound doctrine, regardless of the "odious charge of bigotry," and never to mistake the courtesy which is fashionable in the world, and which would lead us to palliate error, for the divine charity of a Christian.

Like the Apostle Paul, who withstood Peter to the face on account of his dissimulation, the Edinburgh Committee have openly arraigned the Parent Committee, after earnest private exhortation had failed. But do they, like the Reviewer, bring any "*railing accusation*" against their brethren? While they charge the London Committee with a departure from the laws and plan of the Society, do they impute it to wilful dishonesty? While they complain, that there has not been all that candour and openness, which ought long ago to have disclosed the fact, that the Society was circulating what was not the Word of God, do they deny that this error proceeded from benevolence, and zeal for the spread of the truth? By no means: there is not one word from the beginning to the end of the statement, which ought not, in fairness, to be considered as an affectionate though solemn warning to the Committee.

I again repeat, that this outcry about intemperance argues conscious weakness, on the side of those by whom it is made, and I cannot but contrast with this sort of attack the conduct of one of the leading members of the Parent Committee. This gentleman has uniformly supported, the circulation of an intermingled as well as an annexed Apocrypha, with the greatest ingenuity, acuteness, and talent. But it is remarkable, that he has never joined in the bitter attacks which have been made on the Edinburgh statement, and on the contrary is reported to have said in the Committee, that after all, that had been urged against their northern friends, he, for one, must acknowledge that they had been the honestest men with



whom the Committee had had to deal;—that he found no fault with their statement, which spoke their honest and conscientious opinion, —and that in fact, he would rather at once embrace their simple and intelligible proposition, than any one of those ambiguous, unsatisfactory, and conflicting resolutions, which stood on their minute books, or had hitherto been proposed. It is true that he entirely disapproved of the *circulation* of the statement throughout the country, but I only make use of his evidence as that of an upright, fair, and honourable opponent, to shew that the statement is not, even in the judgment of some of the ablest upholders of the Apocrypha, so much characterised by “strong irritation,” and “vindictive feeling,” as is alleged by the Eclectic Reviewer.

In concluding his attack upon the proceedings of the Edinburgh Society, the Reviewer observes, if their principle were to be adopted, “it would prevent grants to a society which distributed prayer-books, homilies, or the Scotch Psalms.” “This,” he continues, “comes with peculiar grace and consistency too, from a Committee who, if we are not misinformed, have themselves sanctioned the circulation of the metrical Psalms, bound up with the Scriptures. Do they then believe that harmonious and inimitable version to be inspired?”\*

What shall we say of the wisdom of this question? Is the Reviewer, *in every particular*, so deeply imbued with the principles of the council of Trent, as to imagine that any *version* is inspired? Faithfulness is the chief desideratum in every translation of an inspired book, and in this respect the metrical Scotch Psalms may vie with any other in the world. The Reviewer may sneer at them; but although they are somewhat rugged and unpolished, and although particular passages may be easily selected to excite the smile of thoughtless levity, they are never mean, and are admirably adapted for the purposes of devotion,—possessing a fidelity, a manliness, and a lofty simplicity, which have, before now, called forth the admiration of critics more discriminating than fastidious, who could feel the sweet influence of the songs of Zion, when sung in some village church, or some humble cottage, to be infinitely more potent in their unadorned rudeness, than when tricked out in more gaudy habiliments, by which the strength of the original is exchanged for paraphrastic weakness, the sense is sacrificed to the sound, and the ear

\* It is indeed true that the Edinburgh Bible Society did, at their own expense, at one time, bind up the Scotch Psalms with *some* of their Bibles, for the accommodation of the poor, who are so much attached to them,—but the Reviewer might have known, that when one of the Vice-Presidents of the Edinburgh Society appeared last December, in the Parent Committee as the representative of his northern friends, he expressly stated that it had never appeared improper to bind up the Scotch Psalms with their Bibles, because they were considered to be merely another, and in some respects more faithful, translation from the original Hebrew,—but pledged himself that the practice should be instantly discontinued. A resolution was subsequently forwarded to London, stating, that those Psalms should no longer be annexed, in order that there might be the most literal adherence to the fundamental law of the Society.

is tickled, while the spirit languishes. These Psalms, possessed as they are of such sterling excellencies, are also endeared to the Scottish peasantry by a thousand recollections; by the memory of their pious ancestors, to whom they often proved a solace and support when wandering from mountain to mountain, and compelled to hide themselves from the rage of the oppressor in dens and caves of the earth. To use the words of an eloquent preacher, "Oh, Scotland! thy rocks still reverberate the song of praise which arose from the solitary band of worshippers assembled on the desert heath, even at the time that armies were gathering round to close upon them, and shed their blood." And does the Reviewer indeed reproach the Edinburgh Committee for having, at one time yielded to a prejudice, founded on such holy recollections, so natural, and so praiseworthy? \*

I have thus, gentlemen, examined, and I hope satisfactorily refuted every material charge, brought against the proceedings of the Edinburgh Committee. I undertook the task, not simply from a regard to the character of a body, composed of men eminent for their talent, their piety, and zeal for the cause of Christ, but from a desire to expose the sophistry, which the Reviewer has adopted in defence of the Apocrypha. Before I conclude, allow me to say a few words respecting an argument, so often advanced and so little proved; namely, that the Bible will not be received by Catholics without the Apocrypha. In regard to countries under the domination of the Papal and Greek churches, we may anticipate every obstacle to the circulation of the Bible in any form. Already has the Russian Bible Society been arrested in its progress, and thus presents a memorable instance, of the little good that is to be expected from compromising the purity of God's Word. At present it is utterly impossible openly to circulate Bibles in the dominions of Austria, Spain, Portugal, Italy, or Sardinia. Of Catholic countries on the continent, Germany and France are alone open to our exertions, and doubtless the priests will there also, more or less, oppose the circulation of a book which denounces their religion as antichristian, and commands men to separate themselves from their

\* Even Burns—the unhappy Burns—was not insensible to the adaptation of the Scotch Psalms to the purposes of devotion. In his "Cotter's Saturday Night" we find the following beautiful lines:—

" They chant their artless notes in simple guise ;  
 They tune their hearts, by far the noblest aim :  
 Perhaps Dundee's wild warbling measures rise,  
 Or plaintive Martyrs, worthy of the name ;  
 Or noble Elgin bears the heavenward flame,  
 The sweetest far of Scotia's holy lays :  
 Compared with these, Italian trills are tame ;  
 The tickled ears no heartfelt raptures raise ;  
 No unison have they with our Creator's praise.  
 Compared with this, how poor Religion's pride,  
 In all the pomp of method and of art,  
 When men display to congregations wide  
 Devotion's every grace except the heart."

idolatries. But it is a fact established on unquestionable evidence, that the people themselves are anxiously desirous to possess the Word of God on any terms, and, at all events, the priests cannot make any plausible objection to the New Testament, which they would not also make to the whole Bible, even with the Apocrypha.

Again, if we turn to the Reformed as well as the Calvinistic churches abroad, we shall find that the most truly faithful ministers desire to have the Bible without the Apocrypha,—that they deprecate the practice of annexing it, and tell us that it is almost uniformly these pastors who are unsound in the faith, *or such good men as are entangled with them, and are subject to their influence*, who express a different opinion.

It has, we know, been also repeatedly and boldly asserted that we shall shut ourselves out from the whole continent of South America, by the adoption of a rule which shall exclude even an intermingled Apocrypha. But to shew how incorrect is the information on which these and similar assertions are made, let us advert to a matter of fact. The Rev. J. Thompson, a correspondent of the Bible Society, and a man of no ordinary talents and attainments, has just returned from South America, after residing for seven years in its different provinces, in the character of a missionary. Mr. Thompson, when in Lima, the capital of Peru, the most bigotted and least enlightened of the new Republics, was requested, by a letter from the Bible Society, to obtain information as to the possibility of circulating the Bible, without the Apocrypha, in that vast continent. “On receipt of this letter,” says Mr. Drummond, “Mr. Thompson determined to consult the ecclesiastical authorities of the country; he accordingly proceeded to the house of a Roman Catholic priest, who possesses the chief influence and authority among his brethren, and who is also a leading member of the legislative assembly. It so happened, that when Mr. Thompson made this visit to the priest, two other leading priests were also present. He stated the case to these three ecclesiastics, mentioned the letter he had received from the Committee of the Bible Society, and the apprehensions which the Committee entertained, that Bibles without the Apocrypha would not be received. Their unanimous answer was, ‘*Let the Bibles come out, by all means, without the Apocrypha; there will be no difficulty on the subject*’!!!

But although these are pleasing and encouraging facts, it is not upon such low grounds that the opponents of the Apocrypha rest their case, nor can the language of the 7th resolution be too often repeated, “That it becomes the British and Foreign Bible Society, in godly simplicity, and in uncompromising faithfulness, in strict adherence to the terms of its charter, and in reliance upon the providence of God, still to follow that one plain, specific, and unsuspicious course which will secure to it the blessing of God, and the firm patronage of all its friends; and that, as it appears by the statement of the Parent Society itself, that ‘the demands upon their generosity, and even their justice, very



“greatly exceed the means at their disposal,’ it is manifestly incumbent on the British and Foreign Bible Society to carry the Word of God to those nations where their labours are now, by their own admission, at a stand for want of means, and where it would be thankfully received pure and unmixed, and not by tacitly sanctioning the false pretensions of an Apocryphal book, to recognise a principle which that Word so solemnly condemns, ‘Let us do evil that good may come.’”

The Christian must live by faith in all things, but no where more pre-eminently than in carrying on the work of God. The Almighty will accomplish his plans according to the dictates of infinite wisdom, and in his counsels he never sanctions the stratagems, or carnal policy of weak and fallible men. Our wisdom must ever be to follow, and not to attempt to lead, to allow the kingdom of Christ to advance in the way which he points out, and neither to trust to our own ideas of prudence or expediency, nor like Uzzah, presume to touch the ark of God. Although “all Scripture is given by inspiration,” yet even the Bible itself will be read in vain without an influence from above, and a single copy of the Word of God, accompanied with the blessing of the Holy Spirit, will effect more than ten thousand without it. If therefore, by abandoning the Apocrypha, every avenue of usefulness should seem to be closed against us, and it appeared as if our Bibles might moulder in our warehouses, we should still be called on to be steadfast, knowing that we were acting in the manner most calculated to promote the glory of God, and the salvation of our fellow-men. Let us not then be led away by idle appeals to our feelings, as if it were in our power to Christianise the world, or as if the choice of the means were left at our disposal. I look on the present controversy, as one between faith and expediency, between confidence in the supreme power of God, and confidence in “an arm of flesh.” Humanly speaking, the supporters of the Apocrypha are the most prudent and rational men, and those who oppose it, under every form, are men who do not “so well understand the world.” The issue will prove whose strength abides in the Most High, and shew that “the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.” Humanly speaking, it was the height of imprudence in Moses to lead the Israelites to the shores of the Red Sea, and those who had not sufficient faith in God exclaimed against the folly of their leader! Humanly speaking, it was folly in David to go forth against Goliath, without even the armour of Saul; and, above all, it must, in the eyes of men, have seemed, in the highest degree, absurd for the Apostles to go forth as they did, to evangelise the nations. Had they acted on the principles of expediency, they would have attempted gradually to prepare the ground; they would have argued that much could not be done at once, and that it was necessary *prudently* to accommodate themselves to the prejudices of the age; they would have acted like the Popish missionaries in China and South America, and tolerated in their converts some of the rites of idolatry, for the sake of removing the offence of the cross. But the



Apostles tell us they knew only "the foolishness of preaching," and yet the whole fabric of Roman idolatry,—a system strong in its antiquity, fortified by prejudice, supported by philosophers, defended by a powerful hierarchy, and backed by Emperors armed with the sword of Rome,—tottered and fell before the ethereal weapons of a few uneducated, persecuted, and friendless fishermen. The Sub-committee of the Bible Society, which is now sitting, has certainly an arduous duty to perform, and a fearful responsibility will attach to its report. I trust its members will be directed by wisdom from above, for on their decision is suspended the momentous question, whether the Society shall go on its way rejoicing, united and prosperous, or whether it shall fall to pieces "like a structure of magic when the talisman is broken."

I have the honour to be,

Gentlemen,

With every sentiment of respect,

Your most obedient Servant,

A MEMBER OF THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

THE END.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY J. MOYES, BOUVERIE STREET.

## ERRATA.

- Page 11, 7 lines from the bottom, *for its read it.*  
— 15, note, *for Dr. Sacy read De Sacy.*  
— 25, line 26, *for contest read context.*  
— 29, note, line 9, *for Scriptures read scrupulous.*

LONDON:

PRINTED BY J. MOYES, BOUVERIE STREET.



## **Introduction to Textual Criticism**

The Following Books or Ebooks will be of use to you If this current Ebook is helpful. Most of these Ebooks are available online, usually Free.

Search online for the Titles or Authors or Keywords and you may be able to find them, for now.

### **Introduction to Textual Criticism - What each Believer should know before they begin their study of Textual Criticism**

If you take the time to read, and to learn, you will become more skilled in the Word, and in its intellectual, philosophical, personal and spiritual defense. In order to learn, you must study, and you Must learn how to READ, and you must Learn the Definitions of Words.

Far too many people now are only equipped to read on a 6th grade level. That is a fine starting place, but you will need more in order to make sense of what is being said, and of the arguments being advanced.

If you learn the definitions, try to remember the arguments, and try to remember how to advance or articulate what you believe, you will become a strong defender of the Faith. This will happen DIRECTLY in proportion to the TIME and the EFFORT and the LEARNING and the STUDY TIME that you decide to put into it.

What you put into it, as the saying goes is what you will get out of it. A few points should be added here. This study about the intellectual and philosophical defense of your history and faith is an issue of spiritual warfare. You must understand this to be the case, and you



must approach this kind of study (as with all Bible Study) in this manner.

The Bible specifically says that the Weapons of our warfare are NOT physical. That means that with reference to battles that are in the spiritual realm, we must understand how to deal with these issues spiritually. If you are young, you may be lucky enough to have the time to do this. That would be great, since many people who are older do not have the time. But do NOT wait for others to come along and teach you. Learn what you can, improve your skills, learn to read, learn to think, learn to ask hard questions. God can handle it.

You must also understand the need to SPEND TIME with God, developing your relationship with Him. You must spend your time not only studying the Bible, but also praying and ASKING GOD to help you develop and have a LOVE for God's Word and a great sense of spiritual discernment. You must Pray to NOT be deceived, and that God would lead you to truth, and to other like-minded people.

Not that we are in favor of spending money, but lets be realistic, go as far as you can with the Free Books online. But understand also that some of these books may not be available for Free. Some definitely are not Free since the books are still in print. We encourage you to buy copies or find some second hand [try [abebooks.com](http://abebooks.com) ]. The more time you spend, the more you will be and become well equipped.

You should learn to memorize the scriptures. The presumption that you will always have access to the books that you want, or to the version of the NT or OT text that you want is FALSE, and you should be attempting to develop your memory and learn a lot, by memorization.

Do not expect others to congratulate you. A few may, but many today are afraid to think for themselves, are afraid to ask questions. Sometimes, when you ask questions, they become afraid because they are being reminded that these questions are those that they asked a long time ago, and they did not bother to find the answers. Sometimes people are reluctant to work with you not because of who YOU are, but because of who THEY are. We should always be patient and helpful to others in anycase, and whether inside the church or not. Most churches today are falling away from the gospel. They do not have the power or the spiritual understanding to be able to teach accurately or recognize truth. You will have to learn how to recognize a true body of believers from a false one, and which questions to ask. That is easier said than done.

Improving your reading and your critical thinking skills are noble goals. Most of society wants to indulge in playing video games or in other activities. Those activities will NOT last. There are many people who are afraid to be courageous, and who are afraid of even trying to find courage. No matter whether you are in a chain of command or not, there are good leaders and then there are fear-of-men kind of leaders. Learning to tell the difference will help you.

About memorization, you should know that in the 1600s and in to the 1800s, those who wanted to become Pastors in the Church of England were required to have memorized all of the Psalms. As you may know, the College of New Jersey (now called Princeton) and Harvard also were originally founded to train Pastors. In order simply to have the chance to Attend, as a BEGINNING STUDENT, those students had to already be fluent in Latin and in Greek. Many of the American Founding fathers passed those tests and went through that training to become Pastors. It shows up later in the great work they did for their nation.

If you take a year, **or even 3 months**, and do all you can to study these books, you will be a better person for it. Leadership in the church, at least formal leadership, is male. That is what the text says. But that is NOT a reason not to study. Everyone should be learning, and this knowledge can be helpful to everyone. The Worth of Men and Women is the same concerning Salvation (PTL), but the roles of Men and Women are usually not the same. But the ministry of each is different, and who they can reach is different. Life is very short, and there are many ways to go astray. On the other hand, learning the book of Proverbs from an accurate translation, those are ways to encourage ourselves and find Godly guidance.

Many people want an "instant" relationship with God. That is possible and must start with Salvation. But after that, the road is long, and good relationships take time. The best relationships, the ones that last, are usually the ones developed over time. God is a very OLD being. And almost all that He does is oriented towards teaching humans the LONG VIEW of life, of relationships, and of learning to walk with Him, and in His Word, the OT and NT. If you invest in that relationship and take it seriously, God will respond no matter what your age. No one is ever too young or too old to start. AND remember God takes your relationship with Him, from where you are at right now, not five years ago, or one year. God loves us and begins each day trying to help us understand Him. He will continue to accomplish this, but He will do this in the context of the rules that He has already explained in the Old and New Testaments. It must be said though, that a relationship with God is Not always easy. It has ups and down, times when you feel close, and times that feel like you are talking to the walls of the room you are in. Those experiences are BOTH normal.

No relationship with any human will be at 100%, 100% of the time. If nothing else, humans are not made that way and they cannot sustain it. Even Moses went up to get the Ten Commandments. But that was not where he stayed for the rest of his life. And just to be sure, Everyone who wants a relationship with God is often afraid of aspects of it, because we are fallible and make mistakes and have no power because of ourselves, but is infallible and has all genuine power, as the world will know. So if you want a relationship with God, you must be prepared to spend time learning His guidelines and His ways.

To try to approach the work of Textual Criticism somehow apart or divorced from our relationship with Jesus Christ is not possible. Spiritual Discernment (which is the basis for the study) is not possible for those who do not have a relationship with the one who gives authentic Spirituality.

If you are thinking of postponing the study, at the very least, get all of the material in a place that is your place, where you can have access to the material. The material may not be out there for much longer, and you have no idea how soon that time will be. But beyond that, you should consider doing this as soon as possible. You, you personally, will need the level of strength that is being suggested here.

And the reason why you will need the information is in order to be able to develop the spiritual strength that you will need. Whether the rapture takes place or not, whether the economy has collapsed where you are, whether disasters take place where you live, we all are going to need immense spiritual strength. Like anything worth keeping, it must be developed over time. The idea of "Instant" spiritual strength is not usually possible, because it takes time to learn, time to develop



our relationship with God, and time for practice as well as time to learn spiritual discernment.

The reason why you should pursue this, is very simple: there is likely no one else to do this, no one else who Can do it, and no one else who will be able to pull the pieces together to do this, in order to have strength or encouragement to impart [give] to you. So you will have to learn these things, so that you can have enough spiritual strength for yourself, and then maybe to help and encourage others around you.

And if you are the leader in a relationship, as a guy, it is your job to be willing and able to try to encourage spiritually, those you are leading. There is little point in leading, unless you are actually doing that job. God does not give titles without the responsibilities or the job that goes with that. That is why historically, the church [the true church] has always cared so much about the leaders that were chosen.

**Many people will want you to accept to be a slave.** Many people have decided to accept slavery, and they don't want you standing up for yourself. They also don't want you to remind them, that THIS is what they should be doing.

Having constitutional rights means learning how to assert those rights, wherever you can, especially if you are in a nation such as the USA. The rights guaranteed to Americans are the only thing standing between the people OUTSIDE of the USA and their own repressive systems where they live. Many people will want you to become accustomed to not standing up for yourself or for what is right.

In public schools, it is as if young men are being trained as slaves to be prisoners, and young women are being trained as slaves to be

prostitutes. Learn the history of your great nation. Those who love Freedom love the history of England and America, because it is the history of true Liberty and the history of the development of true Freedom and true rights for each person. But some poor teachers of history falsely present the USA as the oppressor. That is not true. The record of the USA is better than the record of any other nation, and than the record of any other empire. Where there are problems, they were not caused by the USA, but rather by rich decision-makers within the leadership who 1) forgot God and 2) were un-godly and doing things to harm people. There is a term for that: they were oppressors and tyrants. Often bad people do bad things. Then they try to shift the blame for their actions [when they were in politics] to the people that they were supposed to represent. Don't accept the false guilt. Don't be tricked into feeling ashamed about your country. Learn the real history, not the easy answers that are usually false and propaganda.

Free Speech rights - guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution are not intended for Popular Speech, or for things that are pleasant. The right to Free Speech is designed to protect your individual right to speak out and to disagree with others. The right to Free Speech protects Speech which is UN-popular, that many people would rather not hear. The truth is hard to listen to some times. We all should try to be diplomatic when possible, but we can each be professional and kind, and still learn to express what is true and accurate, whether others agree with it or not.

The History of America is a great history. The history of the actual *people* who came here is noble, helpful, and encouraging. The same can be said about the history of England and the history of Ireland, and the History of Scotland. The same can be said of the history of the Reformation, which took place all over the world. Yes there are

exceptions, but exceptions are exceptions, NOT the rule. Over and over, this Reformation and Protestant history is the history of helping others, of teaching people to read, of resisting tyranny, of having strength, of the help that God gave those who knew Him, and of the history of the preservation of Liberty and Constitutional rights. It was often Christians who disagreed with the English Kings who were oppressing people abroad, including those in India and China. Christians were disagreeing with their own governments, and were instead working to preserve the rights of the people. (but do Not confuse the term Christian with the Roman Catholic leaders, who were usually spiritual politicians who instituted their global inquisition. Recently those leaders have taken to continuing the oppression of the helpless through their scandals. )

And let us not confuse the *history of England* with the *History of Royalty* in England. The History of the Royalty in England is a sad excuse for weak and bad leadership in too many cases, and the good part of the history, is the history of the people who stood up for themselves. That IS something to be proud of. Much later the British Empire developed and did some good and some bad, but the bad was done, in a way that most Englishmen did not know what was being done in their name. The nobility departed from God and then began doing what is wrong. Those nations who have leaders like this often have a short duration. Nations that repent and install good leaders though, have a much better chance of being alright. God does respond to what the people do, and the leaders that they do replace or put in power.

The history of the Church is a great and positive thing. by the term "church", we are talking mostly about local and independent congregations. We are NOT talking about Church buildings, and we

are not talking about institutions and Hierarchies of religious bureaucrats who also work against freedom and against accurate Bibles, because the Bible teaches that the leaders are accountable to the PEOPLE. Millions of people know nothing about this. Millions of people have never even heard of the reformation, or what it did and accomplished, and that would apply even to American and European Young People. But its lessons are universal. They apply everywhere to everyone, regardless of where you live or where you come from. Christians help others Christians also, and that is universal also. Be the change you want to see in others. If you are young and read this, help your friends to understand. If you are older, then make a copy of this for your kids or grandkids.

Standing up for yourself or for what is right is the right thing to do. But don't expect many people to agree with you, or to applaud or congratulate you, even in the churches. Many of these churches today are not authentic. And many have been visited by certain people, telling the church leaders not to talk about the real Bible or about true Freedom, true Liberty or History. Learn to be wise so you can be effective, and ask the Lord to give you much wisdom. If you are facing particular circumstances, remember the Lord can give you the understanding and strength to be able to handle the circumstances, with HIS help.

This is a lot to take in. Each commitment will continue to require a commitment and re-commitment at a deeper level. Remember other believers have to face what you have to face, and God helped them. Ask God to give you the understanding to know that He is helping you and that He IS answering your prayers. Then again, maybe that you are reading this now, is one such indication.

**Now, on to the books.**



Dictionaries - The best ones are probably the 1828 and 1840 Editions of Noah Webster. They are online and available to you, in PDF. It is important to use the older dictionaries to find the definitions of older words.

If you are a beginner in these matters, please consider the following books.

### **Basics - Old and New Testaments in English**

The King James - this means the standard King James Version, which is the 1611 King James Version.

That is a great translation. It is true that some Bible Societies did mess with the content. If you are not sure about your copy, obtain older copies online. There is the 1611 version actually online for Free [which is a 1911 reprint of the 1611 version]. Download it while you can.

If you want to be sure that you have a real 1611 KJV, you should know that there is a 1611 version that has been printed, which is a reprint of the 1611 version. This has been (in the past) published both by Holman and also by Thomas Nelson. (both leave a lot to be desired as they publish false versions of the text, but they also do publish the version mentioned).

Beyond this, there is a version online of the KJV, which is the 1830-1835 version of the Edinburgh Bible Society. That is available online for Free also. Many of the versions of the N.T. were made available in several downloads. Otherwise the PDF files were found to be too large for most people to download them. That is just life.

The Geneva Bible (The New Testament) is available online. There are several versions of this. Some have good notes, some have reasonable notes, and some have simply bad and wrong notes. The grayscale version of the Geneva Bible of 1560 is usually good.

The Version of the Bible by Scholar Jay Green is good. It is translated from both the right and accurate Old Testament and New Testament accurate text.

If you are using a version of the Old or the New Testament that is modern you should check to find out if it was accomplished (translated) using a Hebrew or Greek text provided by something called the United Bible Societies (UBS). Most modern translations come from that text, and that is why they almost always seem the same. That is also why they have almost no spiritual power within them. The meanings and portions of words and verses have been continually shaved off, altered and re-arranged. They continue to deny this, and students and scholars continue to find proof that they have indeed changed much. There are between 3000 to 5000 changes AT LEAST, between the historic text of the New Testament in Greek that the church used for 2000 years, and the versions now offered by United Bible Societies. They do not like to talk about this, though their usual approach is to ignore the question, or refuse to have a conversation. They also hire people who are good debaters whose salaries they usually pay, or who sit on the board of translation projects that have a relationship to the UBS.

The UBS most common Greek New Testament version is the Nestle-Aland. That is simply a renamed version of the false version of Westcott and Hort, and of the corrupt versions used by Westcott and Hort. In fact, around the world, no matter what the language, when it comes to UBS, you will find that they are are a Westcott and Hort

Only agency. That means that no matter which versions they use and advocate, they will always go back in MAJOR and MOST ways to the corrupt version of Westcott and Hort. These *are Westcott and Hort Only* agencies.

The other thing that they have done is to PRESERVE the name of the older translations. The modern translations therefore have the NAMES of the Older translations, but the Content is very different.

Unless you have been in the King James for 6 months or more, and memorizing the text, and learning the historic and accurate definition of the words, don't expect to know, or learn, or discern the difference.

It takes time to learn to understand HOW to tell the difference. As is the case with law, or psychology or any complex field that uses words, it takes time and study, and the Holy Spirit to discern differences in text.

Therefore many differences in the meanings, and in the shades of meaning will jump out to those who have been using a King James version or a Geneva Bible text. But those who have been using modern versions can be expected to insist that they see no difference at all. That, is the problem. If they respond that way go into the questions provided in the section about "*Doing the research yourself and personally*", provided in the online Ebook "[Hidden History of the Greek Testament](#)" and then ask the modern version users the questions. This will help them to understand how much they have Not studied, and how much they need to.

UBS has allowed people on its board that are not defenders of the historic Christian evangelical faith. They pride themselves on their

cooperation with people and forces who have a vested interest in changed to the text of the New Testament and the Old Testament. The more you study, the more you will find this is the case. Not the least, in the case of UBS, they allowed by contract, the Vatican to have veto control over the content of all UBS editions since the 1960s. (those want the source for this statement will find the proof in the book Fifty Years of UBS). You can also find more in the book The Hidden History of Westcott and Hort, and their Work, available online.

### **Which is best: New books or Old Books ?**

Lets jump right into it. We are often **taught**, in this day and age, that the New Books are the "up to date" place to find information, and that the older books are 1.irrelevant , 2. boring, and 3. overly-detailed. The truth is that there is A LOT of information in the old books that many people do not want you to know about. If you learn that information, you may learn what really happened, and then you would learn to ask inconvenient questions. That is true in the area of History and that is also true in the area of religious freedom and religion. Most of the books today are written at about a 5th grade level. Most books today have only about 30% of the standard length of most books of the past.

Most authors of the past not only knew English, but also knew Latin, Ancient Greek and French, and other languages. It was normal for a person who was learning, to learn *several* languages. That practice did not stop until right before World War I. So the older generations were not more ignorant or less educated. On the contrary, that would apply to most of us today, and we - now - are still trying to catch up.



There is a great deal of encouraging material that has been left by Christians from other centuries who were writing, in order to encourage us. It is up to us to take advantage of that, while we can. Its also a good idea to have backup copies of these books even in Electronic form, in a place where you can use them as needed. Of course, even the Ebooks, most of them, can be printed out for those who wish to.

### **The Beginner's Student or Learner List**

#### **Books that you can expect to pay for, if you can still get them (buy used )**

The Battle for the Bible by Harold Lindsell

The Cost of Commitment by Bonhoffer

IF the foundations be destroyed

What does the NIV have against Jesus by Chick Saliby

A Different Gospel: Biblical and Historical Insights into the Word of Faith Movement by D. R. McConnell

The Great Evangelical Disaster by Francis Schaeffer

A Christian Manifesto by Francis Schaeffer

Who moved the stone by Morrison

Tough questions that critics ask a Verdict by Josh McDowell

Beyond belief to Conviction by Josh McDowell

Hidden Dangers of the Rainbow by C.Cumbey

[ Die sanfte Verführung - Die Autorin beschreibt in diesem Standardwerk Entstehung, Lehren, Ziele und okkulte Wurzeln der New-Age-Bewegung. Sie enthüllt beklemmende Parallelen zur nationalsozialistischen Bewegung und verweist auf die Erfüllung biblischer Endzeitprophezeiungen. (1987) ]

Betrayal: German Churches and the Holocaust

Planned Deception - The Staging by C. Cumbey

The Agony of Deceit by Michael Horton

The Beautiful Side of Evil by Joanna Michaelson

Deceived on Purpose by Warren Smith

A Time of Departing by Ray Yungen

Books on Demonology/Satanism by Merrill Unger

Books on how to respond to the occult by Kurt Koch (he wrote many)

Satan is alive and well by Hal Lindsey

Faith for Earth's Final Hour by Hal Lindsey

Vanished into thin Air by Hal Lindsey

**The Adversary by Marc Bubek**

**Overcoming the Adversary by Bubek**

**Beginner Books - FREE PDF online**

*All of these are **Free Online Books**, at least still for now*

**A Plea for the Canon of Scripture - By Edinburgh Bible Society**

**Statement of the Bible Society relative to the Apocrypha**

**VINDICATION of the Proceedings of Bible Society - related to Apocrypha**

**The Canon of the Old and New Testament By Archibald Alexander - Princeton**

**Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records by Rawlinson**

**Our Own English Bible by Heaton (Part of a Trilogy; Illustrated)**

**The Bible of the Reformation by Heaton (Part of a Trilogy; Illustrated)**

**The Puritan Bible by Heaton (Part of a Trilogy; Illustrated)**

**Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly (RD WILSON)**

The Bible & Modern Criticism by R.A. Anderson

SAYCE - Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies

Doctrine of the Atonement - Eternal Life by Stoughton

The Christ of the Gospels by Henri Meyer

Hidden History of the Greek Testament

### **Problems with the BFBS, the British and Foreign Bible Society**

Reasons for declining to assist in the extrication of dr Thomson's ... By Adam Thomson, James Brydone, Elder of the United Presbyterian Church

Divine inspiration; or, The supernatural influence exerted in the communication of divine truth and its special bearing on the composition of the sacred Scriptures : with notes and illustrations (1847) by Ebenezer Henderson, 1784-1858, disliked by the BFBS because he exposed their mistranslation of scripture as far back as the 1800s. He wrote many good books and commentaries.

The books of the Old and New Testaments proved to be canonical, and their verbal inspiration maintained and established : with an account of the introduction and character of the Apocrypha (1832)



by Robert Haldane (1764-1842). His books also expose and refute the work of some of the errant BFBS translations.

Review of the conduct of the directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society relative to the Apocrypha and to their administration on the continent [Europe]: with an answer to the Rev. C. Simeon, and observations on the Cambridge remarks (1828) by Robert Haldane; This exposes the insistence of the BFBS to mistranslate and to insist on inserting Apocryphal books while the BFBS supporters did not know.

A letter to the right honourable the Earl of Shaftesbury ; president of the British and Foreign Bible Society [BFBS] : on the pantheistic and on the Buddhistic tendency of the Chinese and of the Mongolian versions of the Bible published by that society - By Rev. Malan - 1856

The inspiration & accuracy of the Holy Scriptures (1895)  
by John Urquhart

Constitution of the American Bible Society - 1816

You will notice that this Constitution only gives authorization to publish the Authorized Version of scriptures, "the version now in common use", which in 1816 was the King James Version. Their charter was changed in 1904, to allow the Revised Version of Westcott and Hort, which then also replaced the Textus Receptus. The original 1816 ABS Constitution is available online for Free

Proceedings of the Bible Convention- Which Met in Philadelphia, April 26, 27, 28, and 29, 1837. This is the documentation for the founding of the American and Foreign Bible Society. This happened

after the ABS began to publish versions for India, such as the Bengali versions, among others, that intentionally mistranslated words concerning baptism. [the book dealing with the word Baptizo by Conant gives the historic Ancient Greek explanation of that word, with the quotations in context by Ancient Greek and Roman authors.] {Available online, at Google books. Worth the download.}

The ABS (American Bible Society) report of 1840 [which is now available online] weakly attempts to respond, but admits that the American Bible Society was promoting Roman Catholic Editions, even the deeply flawed Vaticanus-based Latin Vulgates, (see the work of Fulke) first at a time when the Inquisition was still taking place, and second on the basis of accepting to have Versions censored by certain Roman Catholic nations. (Regretable for a Protestant Bible Society, but true).Explains much about the degeneration of modern English versions, also published by these same Bible Societies.

Does the Revised Version affect the New Testament by Thurstaston

Life of Kanamori by Kanamori (on the dangers of mistranslations, etc)

The Only Begotten God - Article online which exposes some of the mistranslation of Tregelles, the Textual Critic who convince the BFBS to reject the Historic Textus Receptus in favor of the Nestle-Westcott-Hort version. Shows the weak and problematic translations of Tregelles.

Universalism- A Modern Invention, and Not According to Godliness  
By Andrew Royce - 1837

[The English Revisers' Greek Text-Shown to be Unauthorized, Except by Egyptian Copies Discarded](#)

Textual Criticism by Paton

Which Version - A search for Answers (about the Revised Version of Westcott and Hort) by Philip Mauro

The higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments By Professor Archibald Henry Sayce (Oxford)

Universalism Unmasked- Or the Spurious Gospel Exposed - 1837

An inquiry into the integrity of the Greek Vulgate- or, Received text of the New Testament 1815 [this is a defense of the accurate text of the New Testament, the Textus Receptus]

On 1 John 5:7

"A vindication of 1 John, v. 7 from the objections of M. Griesbach"

The paramount authority of the Holy Scriptures vindicated (1868)

Bible Witnesses from Bible Lands- Verified in the Researches of the Explorers and Correspondents ... By Robert Morris

Letters from Rome to Friends in England By John William Burgon 1862

[The traditional text of the Holy Gospels vindicated and established \(1896\) by professor John William Burgon \(Oxford\)](#)

[The causes of the corruption of the traditional text of the Holy Gospel](#)

by professor John William Burgon (Oxford)

[The Seventh General Council, the Second of Nicaea, Held A.D. 787](#), in which the Worship of Images 1850 (doctrinal issues of importance in today's world rapidly returning to Idolatry)

Four sermons on the doctrine of [regeneration](#), according to scripture and the Church of England. By George Stanley Faber - 1853

### **The Meaning and Use of the term "Baptizein" - Philologically and Historically Investigated by T. J. Conant**

(whether this topic personally matters to you, is irrelevant. The reason is that frankly, that topic of salvation by baptism matters to millions and millions of people. So you should know what the accurate understanding of the words are in the Bible, and you should have the proof you need to defend the Biblical point of view. This book provides that to you - Available Free Online)

Studies in the book of Daniel by R.D. Wilson

Books by [R.A Torrey](#) (good for new or young believers)

Books on Textual Criticism and Archeology by Robert A [R.A.] Anderson

Books by professor John William Burgon (Oxford)

## Concerning the Roman Catholic Church and Textual Alterations or Textual Criticism

Before anything else, if this needs to be stated, let it be clear, we support the Right of everyone and anyone to believe whatever they chose, and whether they would agree with us OR NOT, and we will work to preserve the rights of everyone to be able to speak Freely. That is what all humans should be able to do.

God is not afraid of the conversations of Humans. He is a big God. He can handle it. Humans have nothing to fear, from the Free Speech of others.

Do not confuse being opposed to Vatican bureaucrats and their mis-use of power, with being against the common people in any way. We support the rights of all faiths to teach the content of whatever they chose, within the bounds of promoting constitutional rights, and human freedom and human liberty.

Each of us has the right to chose what to believe and follow. That is one of the rights that God gives to each Human.

You will note that seriously, we are sticking pretty much to books that deal with the Roman Catholic Church and Textual Criticism. Those wanting books dealing with the Political Aspects of the Vatican may want the following books:

History of the Spanish Inquisition - 4 Volumes Free  
by Henry Charles Lea

The Censorship of the Church of Rome and Its Influence Upon the Production... -1906 - 2 Vol



The Pontifical decrees against the doctrine of the earth's movement and the ...by William W. Roberts

Keys of the Blood by Malachi Martin  
(explains much about the Vatican worldview of politics)

The works of Avro Manhattan (available online Free)

### **Books on the issues of defense of the Biblical text and historic doctrines and Roman Catholicism :**

**The Two Babylons by Hislop**

**The Papal System by Cathcart**

**Accusations of History (Rome) by Townsend**

**Saint Patrick and the Western Apostolic Churches**

**The Worship of Mary by J. Endell Tyler**

**Image Worship & the Ante-Nicene Fathers (Early Church Fathers) by J. Endell Tyler**

**THE ROMAN SCHISM by Perceval**

**The PAPAL SYSTEM by Cathcart**

The Israel of the Alps by Muston - 2 Vol - A History of the Church that explains and documents how the Waldensians and other independent Evangelicals **predated** (came before) the formation of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. Written in English but with much

documentation in other languages. Many sources. A French Edition of this exists also.

A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures Into the English Tongue ... (1843) by William Fulke  
Contains much material dealing with the Douay Version and that also affects the Geneva and King James version.

Accusations of History against the Church of Rome by Townsend

Secret History of the Oxford Movement by Walsh

The Oxford Movement by D'Aubigne  
(sometimes spelled simply Daubigne) - by the author of the works on the History of the Reformation. A sound and interesting author.  
Paganism Popery (Roman Catholicism) and Christianity by Berg

Author Faber, George Stanley, 1773-1854.

Christ's discourse at Capernaum : fatal to the doctrine of transubstantiation on the very principle of exposition adopted by the divines of the Roman Church and suicidally maintained by Dr. Wiseman, associated with remarks on Dr. Wiseman's lectures on the principal doctrines and practices of the (Roman) Catholic Church / by George Stanley Faber. - 1840.

The apostolicity of Trinitarianism: or, The testimony of history, to the positive antiquity, and to the apostolical inculcation, of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. By George Stanley Faber-1832

The difficulties of Romanism. By George Stanley Faber ..  
Philadelphia, Towar & Hogan, 1829

## On the Old Testament

Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah by  
Alfred Edersheim (2 Vol - 1800s - Available online  
in PDF - Free)

Introduction to the Masoretico-Critical Edition of the  
Hebrew Bible by C.D. Ginsburg [2 Vol - Online Free]

Historical EVIDENCES of the TRUTH of the Records  
of Scripture by Rawlinson (Archeologist) [Online Free]

The Old and New Testament connected in the history of the  
Jews and neighbouring nations - Prideaux [2 Vol - Online Free]

Life of Kanamori by Kanamori (on the consequences of the  
problems in textual criticism. Provides solution also)(Online)

New Testament in Hebrew by C.D. Ginsburg (1800s)

**[Note:** *Accurate* New Testaments in Hebrew are very difficult to find, and most modern versions use the wrong text. Instead consider the King James of 1611 (not the *changed* NKJV), The Geneva Bible, or the Modern English New Testament of Jay Green, which is translated from the correct and accurate Ancient Greek Text, which is the historic Textus Receptus of Stephens (1550/51).]

What is the **Accurate** Hebrew Old Testament ?The Second Rabbinic Bible of Ben Chayyim (Ben Hakkim / **Jacob ben Chajim Ibn Adonijah**)Produced in Venice in 1525 at the workshop of Daniel Bomberg.

What is the accurate New Testament in Ancient Koine Greek ?

There are a few versions, and these would be much better than any produced by the UBS, the United Bible Societies. The Older and Historic Editions of the Greek New Testament includes:

1. The Textus Receptus of Stephens / Estienne (1550 / 1551) considered the best.
2. The Textus Receptus published by Cura P. Wilson - the 1833 version, available online in Free PDF format.
3. The Textus Receptus of FHA Scrivener, his edition of 1860 [Beware of editions printed after his death, which were changed and which show many notes and notations that attack the T.R. and refer constantly to Westcott and Hort]
4. Not in Greek, but in Latin, the Latin New Testament (Novum Testamentum) of Beza is a sound and Biblical Translation of the New Testament in Latin.

### **The Intermediate/ more advanced - Student or Learner List**

**The Revision Revised by John William Burgon - Oxford (all books by Burgon)** [This is part 3 of his 3 Volume works explaining the historic accuracy of the standard Textus Receptus, the received text of the Bible used for 2000 years]

Recapitulated apostasy - concealed apocalyptic ...by George Stanley Faber...deals with the history and prophecy relating to the number 666.

Codex B and its Allies by professor Hoskier (deals with NKJV / Von Soden / etc), Greek Manuscripts and what the problems are between Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, which contradict each other in thousands of places.

[Please note: If you find any of the books to be inaccurate, then by all means please refute them, using documentation and proof.

Most people who object to almost any of these books have one feature in common: they have not **actually read** the books they are objecting to, for themselves. Often those who criticize the books also have one main goal: to prevent others from actually reading the books.

This tactic is used by certain professors [sometimes also false Biblical critics] to discourage intellectual inquiry, where if the students were to actually read the words censored or banned by the professors, plenty of documentation and information would be found to refute the false premises being advanced].

**ALSO, DO PLEASE CONTINUE to PRAY FOR US. WE NEED IT, AND COUNT ON YOUR PRAYERS TO GOD, FOR US TO BE ABLE TO CONTINUE THE WORK THAT is OF HELP TO OTHERS.**



A word about computers: It should be obvious, but if you are using storage systems that are called ONLINE storage systems, consider NOT using them. Online storage systems are systems that use the Internet to get you to have a place to hold your information, outside of your immediate reach. In these days when we do not know what will happen, that is NOT a wise approach. Online systems use their hard drives, and then store your information on it. Many others have access to your information, even though this is denied. Learn to back up your own information, on drives that you have, that are close to where you are. A word to the wise...

Disclaimer - Nothing herein should be construed as a 100% endorsement of any author or book. We respect the right of each individual to make up their own mind. Further where we have suggested certain books by certain authors, this does not automatically suggest that we would automatically recommend other books by those same authors. Most of these authors are good, positive, encouraging and uplifting, but each person must make up their own mind. We simply hope to encourage people to find a few options that might be of encouragement to them.